DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 366 250 HE 027 092

AUTHOR	Cook, Margaret Ann Homer
TITLE	A Survey of Selected Public Policy-Makers in the Deep South States of Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee To Identify Their Attitudes and Perceptions of the Desegregation Process of Higher Education.
PUB DATE	Dec 93
NOTE	233p.; Ph.D. Dissertation, University of Mississippi.
PUB TYPE	Dissertations/Theses - Doctoral Dissertations (041) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC10 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Attitudes; Black Colleges; *College Desegregation; College Presidents; Educational Policy; *Higher Education; *Policy Formation; Political Influences; *Public Policy; Racial Relations; Regional Attitudes; State Boards of Education
IDENTIFIERS	Alabama; Arkansas; Louisiana; Mississippi; State Legislators; Tennessee; *United States (Deep South)

ABSTRACT

This study surveyed the attitudes of public policy makers in higher education from Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee to find areas for developing fundamental policies for desegregation. A total of 71 surveys were mailed to state higher education executive officers (SHEEOs), legislative chairs of education or of higher education, and presidents of historically white and historically black universities. Data analysis of the 63 returned surveys consisted of general descriptive statistics to report the percent of the population who agreed or disagreed on each component of the 13 statements on the questionnaire. The data also allowed analysis of four subgroups: SHEEOs, legislative chairs, presidents of historically white universities, and presidents of historically black universities. A ranking using combined positive responses showed that the higher percent of positive responses revealed those areas of most agreement. A consensus was defined as 50.1 percent or more of each subgroup responding in the positive or negative. Results found broad agreement on eight areas of desegregation, agreement on five types of events with merit in accomplishing desegregation, agreement that all of four proposed types of events significantly advanced desegregation, and consensus that the groups with the most influence on desegregation are the judicial system, the Federal Office of Civil Rights, and governing boards. Appendixes contain instruments, correspondence, and data. (Contains 33 references.) (JB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

HE

ED 366 250

A SURVEY OF SELECTED PUBLIC POLICY-MAKERS IN THE DEEP SOUTH STATES OF ARKANSAS, ALABAMA, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI AND TENNESSEE TO IDENTIFY THEIR ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

BY

MARGARET ANN HOMER COOK

B. S., Delta State College 1967
M. B. A., Mississippi College 1987

A Dissertation
Submitted to the Faculty of
The University of Mississippi
in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy
in the School of Education

The University of Mississippi

December, 1993

HE027092

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Margaret Ann Homer Cook

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

©

by Margaret Ann Homer Cook

ABSTRACT

A SURVEY OF SELECTED PUBLIC POLICY-MAKERS IN THE DEEP SOUTH STATES OF ARKANSAS, ALABAMA, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI AND TENNESSEE TO IDENTIFY THEIR ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

COOK, MARGARET ANN HOMER. B.S., Delta State College, 1967.
M.B.A., Mississippi College, 1987.
Ph.D., University of Mississippi, 1993.
Dissertation directed by Dr. Frank Moak, Professor.

A purpose of the study was to survey the attitudes and perceptions of a selected group of public policy-makers within Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee. A second purpose was to determine areas which could form a genuine set of fundamental policies for desegregation. The public policy-makers were State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO's), Legislative Chairs of Education and/or Higher Education, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Presidents of Historically Black Universities from within the five-state region of the Deep South. A total of seventy-one (71) surveys were mailed, which represented 100% of the population, and sixty-three (63) surveys were returned for an overall response rate of 88.73%.

No interpretation of the data was made. Data analysis consisted of the use of general descriptive statistics to report the percent of the survey population who agreed or disagreed on each component of the thirteen (13) statements on the questionnaire.

The data was collected so that it allowed an analysis of the four subgroups: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Presidents of Historically Black Universities. A ranking using combined positive responses was listed as those elements with the most support. The higher percent of the positive responses revealed those areas of most agreement. A consensus was considered when 50.1% or more of each subgroup responded in the positive or negative.

Recommendations were made for further study on the use of those items with the largest consensus to develop a genuine set of desegregation policies for the region. A survey is needed to determine if there are successful models of desegregation of public higher education which incorporate components of this study indicated by respondents as being important to quality desegregation. A follow-up study was recommended after the Ayers versus Fordice case is concluded to determine if there are any changes in attitudes and perceptions from this benchmark study. A recommendation was made for further study to determine why a consensus was not reached on those items of disagreement. A study on regional consensus building on the topic of the desegregation of higher education was recommended.

A SURVEY OF SELECTED PUBLIC POLICY-MAKERS IN THE DEEP SOUTH STATES OF ARKANSAS, ALABAMA, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI AND TENNESSEE TO IDENTIFY THEIR ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

BY

MARGARET ANN HOMER COOK

____
Professor Emeritus of Higher Education
and Professor of Southern Studies
(Director of the Dissertation)

____
Professor of Art and Vice Chancellor
for Executive Affairs

____
Associate Professor of Education
and Assistant Commissioner for
Research and Special Projects

____
Assistant Professor of Educational
Leadership and Director of Jackson Campus

____
Dean of the Graduate School

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

It would have been impossible for me to have completed this project without the support of many individuals. From the beginning of this educational endeavor, I have felt Dr. Frank Moak's support as a classroom professor and director of this project. I thank Dr. Milton Baxter for his daily on-site assistance and time spent on topic selection. I thank Dr. Les Wyatt for his encouragement to tackle a controversial topic and his steady assistance with the development of the survey instrument. I thank Dr. Glenda Lester for her encouragement.

I am grateful to Dr. W. Ray Cleere, my employer, for his unwavering support and endorsement. Also, I am especially appreciative to my personal coaches, Dr. Charles Pickett, Dr. Jeanne Forrester, and Dr. Cass Pennington. My appreciation to Ms. Lisa Brown is unlimited for her steady belief that this project would be completed. I am thankful for a wonderful staff of Ms. Marilyn Beach, Ms. Lisa Brown, Ms. Tracey Miller, and Ms. Betty Ruth Hawkins. Without Ms. Marilyn Beach's and Ms. Lisa Brown's typing, proof reading, and formatting tables, and Ms. Tracey Miller's editing, there would be no project. Ms. Betty Ruth Hawkins was there with the necessary amount of humor. Dr. Bill Repogle was of great assistance with the statistics. My thanks to them all.

I am especially grateful to the courageous policy-makers who responded to my survey knowing that the topic of desegregation is complex and often misunderstood. I am

appreciative of their time and effort.

My many thanks to Dr. Walter Washington and Dr. Mark Musick for their endorsement of this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES xii

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION 1
   - STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM 1
   - PURPOSES OF THE STUDY 3
   - SIGNIFICANCE OF THE STUDY 4
   - LIMITATIONS AND DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY . 4
   - DEFINITION OF TERMS 5
     - Adams States 5
     - Deep South States 5
     - Historically Black Institutions 5
     - Historically White Institutions 6
     - Legislative Chair 6
     - President or Chancellor 6
     - SHEEO 6
     - Single Statewide Consolidated Governing Board 6
     - Statewide Coordinating Board 7
     - University 7

Chapter Page

DESIGN OF THE STUDY 7

Preliminary Steps 7

Participants In The Study 8

Development Of The Instrument 9

Pilot Study 11

Data Collection 11

Data Analysis 12

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS 12

2. REVIEW OF LITERATURE 13

HISTORICAL BASIS 13

BARRIERS TO DESEGREGATION 20

CURRENT STATUS OF DESEGREGATION 24

CONCLUSION 27

3. METHODOLOGY 29

DESIGN OF THE STUDY 29

PILOT SURVEY 29

PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY 30

DEVELOPMENT OF THE SURVEY INSTRUMENT 30

COLLECTION OF DATA 31

Chapter Page

TREATMENT OF THE DATA 32

4. ANALYSIS OF THE DATA 33

GENERAL DESCRIPTIVE DATA 33

RESULTS OF SURVEY 34

DEMOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION ON RESPONDENTS 106

5. SUMMARY, FINDINGS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS . . . 110

SUMMARY 110

FINDINGS 111

RECOMMENDATIONS 119

REFERENCES 121

APPENDICES

A. LEGAL REVIEW, MR. STEVE KIRCHMAYR, ESQUIRE . . . 126

B. SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE 128

C. LETTERS OF TRANSMITTAL TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY 131

D. LETTER TO PILOT SURVEY PARTICIPANTS 133

E. LETTERS OF ENDORSEMENT

DR. RAY CLEERE 135

DR. WALTER WASHINGTON 136

DR. MARK MUSICK 137

F. FACULTY DATA FOR DEEP SOUTH STATES 139

Chapter Page

G. KEY DATES

ARKANSAS 145

ALABAMA 151

LOUISIANA 161

MISSISSIPPI 165

TENNESSEE 170

H. SUBGROUP MEAN RESPONSES 190

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR 197

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

1. Summary of SHEEO, Legislative Chair, and Presidential Subgroup Responses in Rank Order of Percentage Agreement on Components of Desegregation 35

2. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement A 37

3. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement A 38

4. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement A 39

5. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement A 41

6. Response of Total Subgroups, Positive Agreement - Statement A 44

7. Analysis of Subgroups' Response to Statement A 45

8. Response of Total Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Historically Black Universities - Statement B. 47

9. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement B 48

10. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement B 49

11. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement B 50

12. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement B 51

Table Page

13. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement C 53

14. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement C 55

15. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement C 55

16. Response of Subgroup: Presidents, Historically White Universities - Statement C 56

17. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement C 56

18. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement D 57

19. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement D 59

20. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement D 59

21. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement D 60

22. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement D 61

23. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement E 63

24. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement E 65

25. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement E 66

Table Page

26. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement E 67

27. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement E 68

28. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement F 70

29. Response of Group Combined: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement F 72

30. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement F 75

31. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement F 76

32. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement F 77

33. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement F 78

34. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement G 79

35. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement G 80

36. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement G 80

37. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement G 81

38. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement G 82

Table Page

39. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement H 84

40. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities, Combined Positives and Negatives - Statement H 85

41. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement H 86

42. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement H 88

43. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement H 89

44. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement H 90

45. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement H 92

46. Positive Rank Order by Subgroup - Statement H 94

47. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement I 96

48. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement J 97

49. Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's - Statement J 98

50. Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs - Statement J 98

51. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities - Statement J 99

Table Page

52. Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement J 99

53. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement K 101

54. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement L 104

55. Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities - Statement M 105

56. Respondents' Number of Years' Experience in Higher Education 107

57. Number of Years' Experience in Legislature - Legislative Chairs 108

58. Geographical Location of Employment of Four Survey Subgroups 109

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Kerr states that "The 1990's will be a decade of major changes and conflicts, the scenarios of which are rooted in history, often external in origin, and sometimes beyond direct control of higher education." Higher education in the Deep South States of Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee finds itself reflecting these words and those of Abraham Lincoln, "We cannot escape history" (Kerr, 1990, p. 5). The Deep South's history includes among other things a rigid system of segregated higher education systems. The 1990's present a decade of opportunity to create a new history, but this opportunity is not without problems. The major problem is that there is neither a definitive public policy direction about how to desegregate public higher education since it is a voluntary educational system nor are there acceptable methodologies to attain desegregation. Preer states in the Journal of Higher Education that the efforts to accomplish desegregation have been two-fold: one is to remove legally-enforced segregation, and the second is to maximize equal opportunities for all (Preer, 1982). The public policy leaders in the Deep South States find themselves at different points along the desegregation continuum, which makes for a difficult regional solution.

Desegregation of higher education has been an issue for the Deep South States of Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee since the late nineteenth century. The Plessy versus Ferguson, 163 U. S. 537 (1896) case was one in which the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that "separate but equal" public facilities were not in violation of the Constitution, but the Brown decisions in 1954 and 1955, which focused on public schools, completely reversed the Plessy decision (Haynes, III, 1978).

Additionally, a position taken by the U. S. Supreme Court on June 26, 1992, in United States versus Fordice, Governor of Mississippi, et al. (Ayers case) was that maintaining public institutions as exclusively black enclaves by private choice is not a concept of public education sanctioned by the Court. The Court ruled that the lower courts did not apply the proper legal standard in their ruling, and when the correct ruling is applied, factual findings of the District Court showed there are several "surviving aspects of Mississippi's prior dual system which are constitutionally suspect" that Mississippi must either justify or eliminate (Ayers versus Fordice, 1992).

The Ayers case appears to have multiple ramifications in several significant ways on all states which have historically black universities, particularly those in the Deep South. First, the U. S. Supreme Court's ruling in Ayers versus Fordice opens all public colleges and universities for review as to the presence of de jure (by law) remnants of desegregation.

Secondly, since Brown versus Board of Education abolished segregation, the Ayers case ruling is not one that questions the acceptance of the legal concept of desegregation, but rather questions the methodologies used by one state to attain desegregation. If the State of Mississippi made a "good faith" effort to eliminate segregation in higher education, then the 1992 Ayers case ruling is evidence that there may be differing attitudes and perceptions among policy-makers in higher education as to what constitutes segregation and/or desegregation in current and future applications. Since desegregation has been to the U. S. Supreme Court in one form or another since 1896, it appears that the public education sector has not reached a definitive position on when, where or how segregation is to be eliminated, as ordered by the U. S. Supreme Court as early as 1954 in the Brown case and as recently as 1992 in the Ayers case.

There appears to be a legal debate as to what desegregation is and how it is to be accomplished (Williams-Bishop, 1991). In the Deep South States, efforts toward desegregation have been confusing. These efforts appear to be time-consuming without major results or resolution of the problem. The struggle continues to perpetuate divisiveness among the states' public policy-makers, or at a minimum, is not bringing public policy-makers together to draw a consensus for resolution.

Purposes of the Study

The purposes of the study are

1. To survey the attitudes and perceptions of a selected group of public policy-makers within Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee.

2. To determine areas which could form a genuine set of fundamental policies for desegregation.

Significance of the Study

The significance of the study is in providing public policy-makers broader options that could be of assistance in developing meaningful and geographical desegregation policies. There is a need for determining how to solve residual problems, which are expensive in lost educational opportunities and human talent, as well as in community unity. By identifying the prevailing attitudes and perceptions on desegregation among public education policy-makers, a basis is created. This base can begin discussions toward problem resolution or, at the minimum, toward a benchmark of attitudes and perceptions in 1992 after the Ayers Supreme Court decision.

Limitations and Delimitations

The specific delimitations which are imposed on this study are

1. The survey was delimited to the Deep South States of Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee.
2. The policy-makers were delimited to the state higher education executive officers, the fifty-six (56) presidents of four-year public universities and the chairs of the committees which handle university issues of the legislatures of the study states (HEP, 1993).

A major limitation of the study was the lack of scholarly research, since the litigation in several of these states is recent. It is noted that desegregation of public secondary education has produced extensive publication that the more recent desegregation of higher education has not yet produced.

The study used a survey conducted in the summer of 1993. Results may not be replicable beyond the Deep South States, and may not apply to a larger population. The results of the survey are reported, not analyzed, as to basis within the region.

Definition of Terms

An understanding of the following terms aids readability of the study, and the terms will be capitalized throughout this study:

Adams States

The Adams States are Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma, North Carolina, Florida, Arkansas, Georgia, Maryland, Pennsylvania and Virginia. In 1970, the NAACP Legal Defense Fund filed a class action suit, which became styled Adams versus Richardson, to require the U. S. Department of Health and Human Services and the U. S. Office of Civil rights to obtain acceptable desegregation plans from these ten states (Haynes, III, 1978).

Deep South States

The term "Deep South States" refers to Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee, which are located in the Southeastern region of the United States of America. Deep South States will be capitalized throughout this project.

Historically Black Institutions

The term "Historically Black Institutions" is defined as those institutions founded before 1954 for black students. In 1954, racial segregation in education was declared unconstitutional (Brown versus Board of Education). This definition is ascribed to by the Southern Regional Education Board (HEP Higher Education Directory, 1993). The use of the related terms "Presidents of Historically Black Institutions" and "Presidents of Historically Black Universities" are used interchangeably.

Historically White Institutions

The term "Historically White Institutions" is defined as those institutions which have traditionally served whites and are listed in the 1993 HEP Higher Education Directory. The use of the related terms "Presidents of Historically White Institutions" and "Presidents of Historically White Universities" are used interchangeably.

Legislative Chair

"Legislative Chair" is a term defined as an individual who serves as the chairperson of a legislative committee which deals primarily with statutory issues relating to higher education.

President or Chancellor

The term "President" or "Chancellor" is used to denote the chief executive officer of a university.

SHEEO

The acronym "SHEEO" is used to denote a State Higher Education Executive Officer of a governing board or coordinating board. There was no differentiation made between a SHEEO of a coordinating board or a SHEEO of a governing board.

Single Statewide Consolidated Governing Board

The oldest and most powerful type of board, this board utilizes the traditional kinds of powers and duties to govern all public senior institutions (and sometimes the community colleges) in the state. The board exercises strength in role and mission development, budget development, and resource allocation (Cole, 1988).

Statewide Coordinating Board

This board coordinates public and sometimes private higher education within the state. A coordinating board exercises strength through budget development of equitable formulas; program approval focused on controlling duplication; and comprehensive planning (Cole, 1988).

University

University is a four-year public higher education entity which carries the word "university" in its name regardless of student size or campus size. Size of institution is not be a factor in the analysis.

Design Of The Study

These procedures were followed in order to achieve the purposes of this study.

Preliminary Steps

A review of the literature was conducted as it relates to issues of importance in desegregating higher education at public four-year universities. A computer search was conducted to assist in this effort. The researcher looked for current issues as reflected over the last several years, but incorporated issues which have continued to exist without resolution over the 18-year period that the Ayers vs. Fordice case has been in litigation. Numerous contacts were made with individuals in Mississippi and the contiguous states that are presently involved in desegregation legal cases. Additionally, the survey instrument received a review by legal counsel for the Mississippi Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning to ensure that no legal conflicts existed between this study and the ongoing Ayers litigation in Mississippi (Appendix A).

Participants in the Study

The participants were policy-makers in public higher education in the Deep South States of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee. The policy-makers were selected because of their positions. One group was the State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO's). These individuals, as representatives of statewide governing/coordinating boards, are in positions which develop desegregation plans for university implementation. These names were obtained from the SHEEO office in Denver, Colorado. The total population of five (5) was surveyed.

Additionally, presidents and chancellors of universities were surveyed. This group consisted of chief institutional officers of four-year public institutions who were charged with implementing desegregation policies and determining the means to accomplish the task. This group consisted of presidents/chancellors with the subgroups being historically black institutions and historically white institutions. The names of these universities and presidents were obtained from the 1993 Higher Education Directory. There were forty-five (45) historically white and eleven (11) historically black institution presidents/chancellors for a total population of fifty-six (56).

Lastly, the chairs of legislative education committees of each Deep South State were surveyed to determine attitudes and perceptions of those charged with drafting and passing state laws that affect higher education. The names and addresses of these individuals were obtained by contact with each state's capital staff or through the higher education board's staff and by requests for the names of individual senators and representatives who work as chairs of committees which are concerned primarily with education. In some states, the chair of education handled all levels of education from elementary through graduate. In other states, the chair of the universities and colleges committee handled education. In all cases, university-related legislation passed through the chairs' committees. There were ten (10) of these individuals, and all were surveyed.

Development of the Instrument

The survey instrument was developed using items from the Ayers U. S. Supreme Court ruling, from current literature, and from historical materials from each state included in the study (Appendix B). The survey items were tested by a diverse group of ten university administrators with race and gender composition as follows:

RACE	GENDER
Black, 5	Men, 8
White, 5	Women, 2

The researcher developed thirteen (13) questions with numerous sub-parts in three broad groupings. The broad groupings were the current status of desegregation, which included history, barriers, and environment; bringing about/accomplishing desegregation; and the results of desegregation. Questions were included which were issue-oriented, time and demographic in nature.

A key was developed which allowed for negative, neutral, or positive responses. The respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which each of the phrases describes their attitudes or perceptions. The four (4) or five (5) point Likert-type scale was used, with responses ranging from "Strongly Agree" to "Strongly Disagree;" "Extreme Merit" to "No Merit;" "Highly Appropriate" to "Inappropriate;" "Significant Barrier" to "Not a Barrier;" "Strong Positive Influence" to "Strong Negative Influence;" and "Significant Time" to "No Time."

The instrument was designed to be self-administered with basic instructions and with essential clarifications. The survey was estimated to take approximately fifteen (15) minutes to complete. It was professionally typeset and printed on heavy stock paper.

The instrument had seven demographic identification questions for respondents. These questions asked for education level and specialty, type of undergraduate institution, gender, race, age, years of experience, and geographic location. Two questions were added to determine interest in a follow-up study and sharing of information.

The survey mailing included a cover letter (Appendix C) outlining the purpose of the survey; the survey instrument; and a postage paid envelope addressed to the researcher. The self-addressed return envelope was coded to a master list of addresses. Each subgroup's return envelopes were of a different color to allow a check and verification of subgroup.

The researcher advised the participants that the survey was designed to compile a report of responses. There was no effort to establish causes between or among groups, but only to identify differences as indicated by the responses rather than to interpret the responses.

Pilot Study

The content of the original survey was validated over a period of four months. The content was originally reviewed by several higher education administrators.

The instrument was pilot tested on nine individuals who were higher education administrators at the vice-presidential or presidential level. A tenth individual, a non-academician, acted as legal counsel. These individuals were selected because of their position, race, gender, experience level and geographic location.

Data Collection

Each member of the sample was sent a packet containing a letter of transmittal, (Appendix D), a letter of endorsement, a copy of the instrument, and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. The packets to the SHEEO's contained an endorsement letter from a SHEEO (Appendix E). The packets to the presidents of historically black universities contained a letter of endorsement from the longest tenured black president in an American university (Appendix E). The packets to the presidents of historically white universities contained a letter of endorsement from the executive director of the Southern Regional Education Board (Appendix E). The packets for legislative leaders contained no letter of endorsement.

The packets were mailed as follows:

SUBGROUP	DATE MAILED	DATE RETURN REQUESTED
Legislative Chairs	June 14, 1993	July 1, 1993
SHEEO's	June 14, 1993	July 1, 1993
Presidents of Historically Black Universities	June 17, 1993	July 15, 1993
Presidents of Historically White Universities	June 23, 1993	July 15, 1993

To ensure a large percentage of returned surveys, calls were made to the SHEEO's and legislative chairs. In some cases, a second survey was mailed or a survey was faxed, whichever the respondent preferred. Since the subgroup of presidents was larger than the other two subgroups, a second letter of request and survey were mailed. If a third request were necessary, a call from the researcher or a call from the survey endorser was made.

Data Analysis

Computer analysis began after July 20, 1993. Data is presented in descriptive form with the number and percentage responding to each option for each question. Additionally, descriptive statistics are given for the total of the groups.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The researcher used the descriptive statistics to report the prevailing attitudes and perceptions of the public policy-makers on the process of desegregation in the Deep South. No interpretations are made and only survey results are reported. Recommendations are made regarding areas for further study.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

This chapter reviews the literature as it relates to the current status of desegregation and the socio-political environment. The review is conducted as a discussion of the items, including a brief history of desegregation, barriers to desegregation, methodology of desegregation, and the results of desegregation. The history section lists actions which influenced the public policy of desegregation. A section is devoted to barriers and results of desegregation as outlined in the literature. Finally, the current status section includes a statement of each state's status in regard to desegregation.

Historical Basis

Desegregation in higher education has again come to public debate due to the June 26, 1992, Ayers versus Fordice Supreme Court ruling. This ruling is the result of an eighteen year lawsuit brought by the Black Mississippians' Council on Higher Education against the State of Mississippi and its higher education system. The first member of the Council, alphabetically, was Jake Ayers (Adams, 1993). This Supreme Court case was to determine whether or not the State of Mississippi had met the freedom of choice standard and dismantled the effects and vestiges of racial inequality brought about by segregation in public systems of higher education (Blake, Jr., 1991).

The Ayers ruling, while positioning desegregation in the national arena, again brought Mississippi and the Deep South States into the national arena for debate due to being *de jure* (by law) segregated states. The *de jure* segregated states still have racially identifiable public universities (Connell, 1993).

The Mississippi Legislature had created five (5) historically white and three (3) historically black universities by 1950 (Mississippi Board of Trustees, 1992). Alabama had created thirteen (13) historically white institutions and two (2) historically black institutions. Louisiana had ten (10) historically white and three (3) historically black institutions. Tennessee had 8 (eight) historically white and one (1) historically black institution. Arkansas has 8 (eight) historically white and one (1) historically black institution.

Each state has taken a separate path to the goal of desegregation with differing results. The states of Mississippi, Alabama and Louisiana resisted desegregation with administrative, legislative, educational, and legal techniques which denied blacks admission to white colleges and universities (Connell, 1993). It appears that those states with the most universities epitomized what Connell, in her work, The Road to United States vs. Fordice, calls politics of massive resistance. Tennessee and Arkansas each had only one historically black school, and the resistance appeared not to rival the other three states once initial admission was gained.

The initial push for desegregation within these *de jure* states had begun with efforts of a few black individuals to break the color barrier. These individuals had little financial support but did have significant personal perseverance. Later, groups united behind individuals to provide financial and public support. Groups also filed lawsuits similar to the Ayers suit, but these groups were thought to have no connections to existing national or state civil rights organizations (Adams, 1993).

In 1963, John F. Kennedy said, "If an American, because his skin is dark....cannot enjoy the full and free life, which all of us want, then who among us would be content to have the color of his skin changed and stand in his place?" (Navarette, Jr., 1993, p. 8).

The charges that the Deep South States had not dismantled its *de jure* segregated systems began in earnest after passage of the 1964 Civil Rights Law. The Title VI section of that law prohibits the distribution of federal funds to universities and colleges that discriminate on the basis of race, color, or national origin. Nineteen states were found guilty of *de jure* segregation after actions by the U. S. Department of Education, the federal courts, and public interest groups (Williams, 1988). The five Deep South States were included in the nineteen. As a result of this Title VI action, desegregation was required. These states have carried the burden of the nation's Title VI enforcement for the past 15-20 years (Olson, 1990).

The search for equality in higher education has produced a fundamental contradiction in its legal approach. As Tribble states in Desegregation of Higher Education, A Private/Public Cooperative Alternative,

> It is at best problematic to desegregate predominantly white institutions while simultaneously enhancing traditionally black colleges and universities in the same system. An unfortunate outcome of attempting both goals is that predominantly white institutions have successfully enrolled larger percentages of better-prepared black students within the states involved in Title VI, at the same time reducing and

changing the student pool available for traditionally black colleges and universities (Tribble, 1988, p. 93).

The problematic situation Tribble mentions has been further magnified with the Ayers ruling. The Ayers ruling outlined four areas of "remnants of the prior system" of segregation as admission standards, duplication of programs, mission statements, and continued operation of all eight public universities in Mississippi. Whereas the Court rejected ordering the upgrading of the historically black universities as enclaves, it left open whether additional funds are needed in dismantling the *de jure system* (IHL, Vol. 1).

Even prior to the Ayers ruling, the Deep South States were at different junctures as related to their position as states addressed by the Adams ruling. The Adams case was filed by the NAACP Legal Defense Fund to force the elimination of dual systems of higher education. Many saw this case as the most important legal action regarding desegregation and equity of education for blacks since 1954. This was the case which was to identify an acceptable plan to implement higher education and to formulate policies to ensure access and increase participation rates for black Americans (Haynes, III, 1978).

The question arises whether the Ayers case or its predecessor, the Adams case, resolved conflicting policy issues that were initially created, or created grounds for more debate. The Adams case provided an arena for discussion as to the complexity of the definition of access and equal opportunity. Tollett, Director of the Institute for the Study of Educational Policy at Howard University, defines equal educational opportunity as a goal to provide the opportunity through education for all students to fulfill their promise and ambitions. The Ayers case continues the opportunity for discussion as to the definition of access and equal opportunity. The State of Mississippi defined equal opportunity as a system which adopts and implements good faith, racially-neutral policies and practices but allows a freedom to choose a university (Ayers, Vol. 1). Yet, the plaintiffs' attorney, Alvin Chambliss, states that "choice" is a key word. He asks the question, "...if a choice between a football stadium and a cotton patch... or a School of Social Work Degree and a course in a Social Science Department in General Studies is really a freedom of choice?" (Williams-Bishop, 1991). The debate continues as to an acceptable and workable definition of equal opportunity.

Some historians point to the Education Amendments of 1972 and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as positively influencing the equal education opportunities for blacks in higher education (Tollett, 1976), and others point to legal rulings like Adams, Brown, and Ayers as the vehicles which have advanced policy development of school desegregation, while others point to the integration of the military as a major policy resulting in a societal shift of understanding. As stated by Milano and Carey, the military has been used as a vehicle for social change even after it first maintained that separate but equal was possible, in the name of military efficiency. This public policy position of integrating the military was fully accomplished by the 1960's, although blacks had served in the military since the Revolutionary War.

Literature reveals that the public policy position of higher education desegregation appears to have been primarily propelled by federal law enforcement and federal education grant-in-aid and loan programs (Brown, 1988). Additionally, the federal court demanded the reversal of major policies (Orfield, 1991). The literature has been less supportive of states' policies to accomplish desegregation.

Brown in Toward Black Undergraduate Student Equality in American Higher Education gives credit to federal courts and executive branch efforts to desegregate higher education, while pointing out that expanded opportunities in higher education have not resulted in equal college graduation rates, equal performance and equal quality of experiences for black students in America's colleges and universities, and growth in black enrollment in undergraduate and graduate schools.

Historians give little credit to states and their policy-makers in the desegregating of higher education. It appears that speeches captured on film of Alabama Governor George Wallace and Mississippi Governor Ross Barnett are cited as evidence of the states' resistance to desegregation (Williams, 1988). Yet, states have the primary responsibility for public higher education whether by statute or constitution. While historians have given little credit to the states' progressiveness in desegregation, higher commendation is given to private interest groups. Wilson in Toward Black Undergraduate Student Equality in Higher Education reveals that these groups have enjoyed a long history of acceptance and appreciation in the American political process. These groups have used numerous means to advance their causes, such as initiating legal action, sponsoring research, issuing reports, convening conferences, and conducting public demonstrations. Certainly, private interest groups do as their name implies and that is to advance a special interest.

Consequently, historians give private interest groups more credit in the arena of primary and secondary desegregation than in higher education and point to the courts' presumption of the lack of good intentions or willingness of boards of education to comply with the law (Wilson, 1988). One might think that the courts' low trust was not carried over to higher education initially because, as Stimpson wrote in Change in 1993, that since higher education is an intellectual community, its core curricula supports diversity.

While the Adams case was considered a major ruling for desegregation at its time, it is difficult to substantiate the movement toward desegregation. Thomas and McPartland in the Journal of Negro Education state that higher education desegregation facilitated access for blacks to white universities as black enrollment at black colleges and universities declined. They indicate this situation is especially true for the southern black universities, but they indicate undergraduate enrollment declined for whites and blacks during this period. Their study suggested there is a complex public policy question of the costs and benefits of higher education desegregation.

This brief history provides more questions than it answers. Does good policy create successful desegregation? Perhaps legal renderings are necessary prerequisites. Does legal right and educational opportunity create desegregation?

Whether the policy impacts were brought about by the executive branch of federal government, by state law, by judicial decisions, or by private interest groups, the policy debate continues. Critics continue to state that the government has failed over history to address fears like the disappearance of traditionally black colleges and universities (Williams, 1988).

Barriers To Desegregation

The barriers to desegregation are many and complex. The first and foremost barrier appears to be a lack of general consensus on what the barriers are, and more importantly how to address them. Some barriers are defined as categorical, educational and psychosocial (Tollett, 1976). Tollett states that racial discrimination is an example of a categorical barrier; admissions policies are educational barriers, and values of students and faculty are psychosocial barriers. In his opinion, it is the combination of these barriers which spell failure to desegregation efforts. When the categorical and educational barriers are reduced, it is the psychosocial barriers which require creative problem solving. The Institute for the Study of Educational Policy reveals that black students from low income families appear to select public universities. Black students tend to feel more alienated on white than black campuses, and yet they remain on white campuses and graduate if they have the academic ability and resiliency to resist what they regard as hostile environments. Black students often choose a university based on personal belief. The social conscience leads young, black students to historically black universities, while young blacks with better academic records and a higher opinion of their athletic abilities and social popularity choose historically white schools. This latter choice reveals a self-confidence to enter a more competitive environment (Astin/Cross, 1981), although professors at historically black universities indicate this is not always the case (Harvey, 1993).

Research reveals a hostile campus environment as a barrier to black students on white campuses and possibly, to white students on black campuses. It is difficult for students regardless of race to stay where they felt they were neither wanted nor fairly treated (ISEP, 1976).

A specific barrier is the lack of role models. There are positive reasons for the desegregated environment. There are cost and benefit considerations for the black student on white campuses which involve long-term social and economic consequences, such as:

1. Access to useful social networks for job information, contacts and sponsorship;
2. Socialization for aspirations and entrance into "nontraditional" career lives with higher income returns;
3. Development of interpersonal social skills that are useful in interracial contexts; and
4. Willingness to participate in desegregated environments (Braddock II, McPartland, 1988).

Faculty role models are said to be critical to other race students when attending a historically white or black university; therefore, poor faculty distribution may be considered a barrier. The Deep South States have different faculty distributions among them (Appendix F).

In Mississippi, historically black Jackson State University has a white faculty population of 21.4 percent. In Alabama, historically black Alabama State University has 27.5 percent white faculty population, and in Arkansas, historically black University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff has a 17.0 percent white faculty. Louisiana has 29.7 percent white faculty at its historically black Southern University in New Orleans. Tennessee has been under federal mandate requiring race equalization of faculty in its historically black university, Tennessee State, which has a 43.4 percent white faculty. These percentages of white faculty on historically black campuses, ranging from a low of 17.0 to a high of

43.4, are significant in size when compared to the number of black faculty on historically white campuses. The black faculty percentages are lower on historically white campuses, with numbers ranging from a low of .7% at the University of Alabama, Montevallo, to a high of 7.1% at Middle Tennessee State University. If faculty distribution is a barrier, how does one change/reduce that barrier?

The literature emphasizes the need for faculty role models, while it also identifies the problem of the limited availability of new black faculty candidates. Blacks comprise less than five percent of all recipients of doctoral degrees in the United States and less than one percent in several disciplines and specializations (Blackwell, 1988). Again, the distribution raises the difficult question of how to provide other- race role models, since none of America's major institutions and particularly southern institutions, whether historically white or black, has a faculty that looks like America (Navarrette, Jr. 1993). More importantly, literature reveals that the number of new Ph.D. recipients with confirmed plans for academic employment was lower in 1988 than in 1975, with availability of blacks being 12 percent lower (Hoffman, 1993). Blacks earned fewer Ph.D. degrees (951) in 1992 than in 1991 (1,001) (Magner, 1993). These numbers show black faculty to be a scarce resource.

Another barrier to accomplishing desegregation appears to be the population's desire to maintain the status quo. Davis (1993), in his article entitled "The Quest for Equal Education in Mississippi: The Implications of United States v. Fordice," states that a reorganization of higher education which could result in closing or merging universities causes a reaction that crosses the color line because both blacks and whites reject the idea of changing the status quo. He also states that there is a commonly held conviction both in the North and South that the South is another land, sharply differentiated from the rest of the American nation, and exhibiting within itself a remarkable homogeneity.

Many articles cover the position of status quo. There appear to be fewer attempts on what is positive change. The historically black colleges are recognized as the primary educators of black Americans. Those who support the black universities point to those universities as the major motivators of students. Additionally, the historical role of these universities has been to move black Americans into the mainstream (Fleming, 1984). The status quo of these institutions, according to Fleming, is being questioned on two grounds. One is whether the poorer financial resources of historically black universities undermines the education of the minority students attending, and another question is whether segregated institutions are out of place in today's society. A bigger question may be where is the middle ground for consensus? Fleming, like many other writers, questions what is sound educational policy.

Blake, writing in the fall 1991 issue of The Journal of Negro Education, states that "... desegregation is a necessary but insufficient tool for dislodging discrimination." He goes on to state that "While desegregation of all white schools does expand opportunities for black students, the greater losses of opportunity in state historically black colleges and universities results in retrogression." (Blake, 1991, p. 546)

Maintaining all black universities may be considered status quo, but Blake argues that equality does not exist presently. His argument for equality is to enhance the historically black schools while increasing the numbers of blacks in white schools (Blake, 1991).

Blake's arguments are supported by Wagener and Smith, writing in the January/February, 1993, issue of Change magazine. They state that while historically black schools enroll only 20 percent of America's black students, they graduate a third of all black graduates, and that from 1986 to 1990, of the United States' top 10 undergraduate institutions sending blacks to graduate school, nine were historically black schools.

There are those who argue that desegregation does not permit a place for single race institutions among the public universities' domain. The U. S. Supreme Court in the Ayers ruling rejected the proposition that Mississippi may maintain historically black universities as "exclusively black enclaves by private choice" (Harvard Law Review, 1992).

Whether status quo or change is the barrier to desegregation, there are writers who stand in the middle. Wiggins, in his book, The Desegregation Era in Higher Education, ponders whether, "for some desegregation itself has been a goal; for others, a means to one; for others, an anathema" (Wiggins, 1970, p. 38).

Current Status of Desegregation

Each of the five Deep South States has followed different paths to desegregation (Appendix G). Arkansas was one of the original Adams states. The U. S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights completed a review of the Arkansas College and University Plan for Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Statewide Plan, 1977) and the revised addendum, September, 1983 (Plan) and found on February 9, 1988, that the State of Arkansas had substantially complied with the terms of the desegregation plan (Department of Education, 1988).

Alabama, which also was an Adams state, had a December 1991 decision in the Knight v. Alabama from the U. S. District Court for the Northern District of Alabama which appears to be similar to the Ayers litigation. Judge Harold L. Murphy wrote a 365-page opinion after hearing 200 witnesses. His opinion addresses faculty employment, funding, facilities, admissions policies, program duplication, recruitment of white students at Alabama State University, and a monitoring committee and annual reporting (Mohr, Sr. 1993). Alabama's desegregation route was the judiciary.

Louisiana, also an Adams state, received a December 23, 1992, decision from Judge Schwartz after a Special Master had been employed to provide resolution for Louisiana's dual system of Higher Education. On January 20, 1993, Judge Schwartz issued Orders and Reasons denying the U. S. Justice Department's Motion for Reconsideration and to Alter or Amend Judgment and on January 21, 1993 the Louisiana Attorney General filed a notice of appeal with the U. S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, Louisiana (Louisiana Board of Regents, 1993).

Mississippi has been in court since January 29, 1975, regarding higher education desegregation. The Ayers decision from the Supreme Court was rendered June 26, 1992. The Supreme Court remanded the case to the Trial Court. The Trial Court held its first hearing on October 22, 1992, and its second hearing on April 12, 1993. Exchange of discovery responses was held on June 30, 1993, and a discovery conference was held on July 19, 1993 (Arnold, 1993).

Tennessee, in the Geier case, followed the court route to desegregation. The case began on May 21, 1968, with regard to construction at the University of Tennessee.

The Court of Appeals affirmed the Geier case on September 5, 1986, and April 22, 1987. The Desegregation Monitoring Committee approved the 1986 desegregation report.

A chronological listing of key dates for each of the Deep South States appears in Appendix G.

Of the five Deep South States, only Arkansas received desegregation compliance approval by the Department of Education. Four out of five states chose to follow the judicial path of desegregation. In 1993, three of the four are involved in some phase of court decisions. The courts now are the external forces in desegregation. As Clark Kerr states in An Agenda for a New Decade, looking back at the history of higher education in the United States in the twentieth century, five observations can be made:

> 1. Each decade has had its own characteristics.
> 2. It would not have been possible to predict these characteristics.
> 3. These characteristics were more shaped by what was happening outside the academy than inside; that is, higher education was mostly not in control of its own fate.
> 4. Each succeeding generation within higher education nevertheless has sought to predict and plan for the future, as ideally envisioned.
> 5. Higher education, regardless of its powers of divination, survived each successive wave of challenges and expanded on a secular basis in size and function (Kerr, 1990, p. 5).

Especially, the third observation rings true for the Deep South States, for forces outside the academy influenced them, and certainly higher education was mostly not in control of its own fate.

Conclusion

Higher education in the Deep South States cannot escape its history. The 1990's will be a decade of major changes and conflicts in the successful accomplishment of desegregation. Many observers find proposing a research agenda in support of desegregation to be risky business (Williams, 1988). This is a time when much is at risk. The controlling factor should be the future of education and the quality of education twenty years from now (Davis, 1993). The impetus for desegregation came from individuals through court action, but the solutions will be with individuals at the state and university levels who make and implement policies to accomplish desegregation.

With the demographic make-up of the five Deep South States, the issue of desegregation is not going away. When the demographics of the region are reviewed, it is reasonable to acknowledge the continued influence of these numbers. The demographics are as follows:

Selected Demographic Data, 1990 Census, for Alabama, Arkansas
Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee

Measure	Alabama	Arkansas	Louisiana	Mississippi	Tennessee
Population	4,040,587	2,350,725	4,219,973	2,573,216	4,877,185
Percent Black	25.2	15.9	30.7	37.0	16.0
College Enrollment	258,681	n/a	263,233	157,922	279,485
High School Dropouts	12.6	n/a	12.5	n/a	13.4
Percent High School Graduates or Higher	66.9	66.3	68.3	64.3	67.1
Percent Bachelor's Degree or Higher	15.7	13.3	16.1	14.7	16.0
Percent Unemployed	6.9	n/a	9.6	8.4	6.4
Percent Below Poverty	18.3	n/a	23.6	25.2	15.7
Per Capita Income	11,486	n/a	10,635	9,648	12,255
Median Family Income	28,688	n/a	26,313	24,448	29,546

---

*As percent of population aged 16-19
Source: Compiled by Dr. Barbara Logue, Senior Demographer, Institutions of Higher Learning

In conclusion, when predicated upon the demographic realities and the regional need of an educated populace, Harold Hodgkinson, a national demographer, reminds us that, "Tomorrow is indeed an extension of today's trends." The issue of making and implementing successful desegregation policies will become a priority issue for the policy-makers of the Deep South States.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In Chapter 3, the methods and procedures used in obtaining the data for this study are described. Specific areas to be covered are entitled Design of the Study, Pilot Survey, Participants in the Study, Development of the Survey Instrument, Collection of Data, and Treatment of the Data.

Design of the Study

This study was designed to achieve two purposes. The primary purpose of the study was to identify the prevailing attitudes and perceptions on desegregation among public policy-makers. Secondly, the study was to determine areas which could form a genuine set of fundamental policies for desegregation.

Pilot Survey

The survey was designed to capture the respondents relative agreement with selected desegregation issues. The survey instrument selected was a mail questionnaire compiled after a review of literature was conducted to determine issues of importance in desegregating higher education at public four-year universities.

The survey instrument was validated over a period of four months. The content was initially reviewed by higher education administrators with their comments resulting in revisions. A pilot test of the survey was administered to nine higher education administrators who serve at the vice-presidential or presidential level. A tenth individual participating in the pilot survey was an individual who acted as legal counsel in higher education.

Participants in the Study

The participants in the study were selected from four groups of public policy-makers from the states of Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee. These groups were as follows:

- State higher education executive officers
- Presidents/chancellors of historically white universities
- Presidents/chancellors of historically black universities
- Chairs of education legislative committees of each state's house of representatives and senate

Seventy-one (71) persons were surveyed, representing 100% of each of the four subgroup populations within each of the five states.

Development of the Survey Instrument

The questionnaire was designed to collect information on attitudes and perceptions of public policy-makers using issues compiled from the literature. The instrument consisted of 13 questions in three broad groupings as follows: (1) current status of desegregation, which included history, barriers, and environment; (2) accomplishing desegregation; and (3) results of desegregation. The questions were issue-oriented, time-oriented, and demographic in nature.

There were seven demographic questions. These were questions aimed at ascertaining the participant's educational level and specialty, type of undergraduate institution, gender, race, age, years of experience, and geographic location. The last two survey questions were to determine the participant's interest in a follow-up study and sharing of findings.

A Likert-type scale was used to determine the respondents' degree of agreement to information presented in the questionnaire. Detailed instructions were included on the questionnaire which was designed to be self-administered. A single, two-sided, legal page format was used for easy mailing and convenience to the respondent. Additionally, the questionnaire was professionally typeset and printed on heavy, 80-pound bond paper stock.

Collection of Data

The survey instrument was mailed during the period, June 14-23, 1993. The survey packet contained a letter of transmittal from the researcher; a letter of endorsement; a copy of the survey instrument; and a self-addressed, stamped envelope. Three of the four subgroups received a letter of endorsement. State higher education executive officers received a cover letter from a member of SHEEO. Presidents of historically black universities received a letter from a president of a historically black university. Presidents of historically white universities received a cover letter from the executive director of the Southern Regional Education Board. Cover letters were not sent to legislative committee chairs.

The first mailing resulted in a significant return. However, to obtain a higher rate of return, a second survey letter and survey instrument were mailed or faxed and phone calls from the researcher were made to members of SHEEO and legislative chairs. Lastly, a third letter was mailed or a call was made from the endorsers to those who had not responded. To encourage a response, the second and third requests were more personalized.

As of August 23, 1993, the survey return rates were as follows:

Survey Subgroup	Percent Response	Number Surveyed	Number Responding
SHEEO's	100%	5	5
Legislative Chairs	100%	10	10
Presidents/HWU	91%	45	41
Presidents/HBU	64%	11	7

Treatment of the Data

Survey responses were entered into a computer program designed to reveal the number responding to each question. The computer program analyzed each question and its components as to the number and the percent of the population who agreed or disagreed on each component. Due to rounding, not all categories' responses total 100%. These percentages were then presented to form a rankings chart. The findings were then reported for each question in both narrative and tabular form. When positive responses and/or negative responses were summed, the total is reflected in parenthesis in the charts. The groups were too small, even though 100% of the population was surveyed, to compare groups or to infer to a larger group.

CHAPTER 4

ANALYSIS OF THE DATA

The purpose of the study was to survey the attitudes and perceptions of public policy-makers in the Deep South States as to the process of desegregation of higher education. Additionally, a purpose was to determine if there were agreement upon components of desegregation which might form a core of genuine desegregation policies. This chapter analyzes the data obtained from a survey of SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically Black and Presidents of Historically White Universities within the Deep South States.

General Descriptive Data

The survey instrument was mailed to seventy-one (71) individuals as follows: five (5) SHEEO's, ten (10) Legislative Chairs, eleven (11) Presidents of Historically Black Universities, and forty-five (45) Presidents of Historically White Universities. The total response was sixty-three (63) for an 88.73% response rate. The response rate varied by subgroup with the SHEEO's and Legislative Chairs having the highest at 100%. Presidents of Historically White Universities' response rate was 91.11% and the response rate of the Presidents of Historically Black Universities was 63.64%. A number of responses had one or more components not marked, therefore, not counted in the data analysis. Appendix H gives the number of usable observations per component or question per subgroup.

Results of Survey

The sections that follow describe survey responses to each statement by total group and by the four subgroups (SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, and Presidents of Historically Black Universities).

Statement A

Statement A: Please assess the extent to which you agree that the following areas are components of a state's or a university's desegregation policies:

1. University Mission Statements
2. Closures/Mergers:
    - A. Of Programs
    - B. Of Universities
3. Admission Requirements
4. Alumni Views
5. Student Views
6. Program Offerings
7. State's Financial Resources
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards

Table 1 depicts responses to Statement A. More than 50% of the population responded that all areas except **Alumni Views** were components of a state's or university's desegregation policies. The two components receiving over 90% agreement were **University Mission Statements** and **Racial Representation on Governing Boards**. The third area receiving the highest percentage agreement as a desegregation component was **Program Offerings** at 83.8%. The area receiving the lowest percentage agreement as a desegregation component was **Closure of Universities** at 51.6%. **Alumni Views** as a desegregation component was **Closure of Universities** at 51.6%. **Alumni Views** received the most negative responses at 55.7%.

Table 1

Summary of SHEEO, Legislative Chair, and Presidential Subgroup Responses
in Rank Order of Percentage Agreement
on Components of Desegregation
STATEMENT A: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE
THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR
A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES.

Component	Strongly Agree	Agree (Total)*	Disagree	Strongly Disagree (Total)*
University Mission Statements	64.5	27.4 (91.9)	6.5	1.6 (8.1)
Racial Representation on Governing Boards	43.5	46.8 (90.3)	6.5	3.2 (9.7)
Program Offerings	29.0	54.8 (83.8)	12.9	3.2 (16.1)
Reallocation of Existing Resources	19.4	58.1 (77.5)	16.1	6.5 (22.6)
Admission Requirements	41.3	34.9 (76.2)	15.9	7.9 (23.8)
State's Financial Resources	29.5	45.9 (75.4)	16.4	8.2 (24.6)
Student Views	11.5	57.4 (68.9)	23.0	8.2 (31.2)
Closures/Mergers of Programs	19.4	45.2 (64.6)	29.0	6.5 (35.5)
Equity Funding for Past Disparity	22.6	38.7 (61.3)	24.2	14.5 (38.7)
Closures/Mergers of Universities	14.5	37.1 (51.6)	29.0	19.4 (48.4)
Alumni Views	8.2	36.1 (44.3)	39.3	16.4 (55.7)

*Total is the sum of positive or negative responses.

While the total responses measured more than 51.6% that all areas, except **Alumni Views**, were components of desegregation policies, when totaling strongly agree and agree, not all subgroups gave equal value to the same components. Each subgroup measured the components differently, as shown in Tables 2, 3, 4, & 5. Since the subgroups of SHEEO, Legislative Chairs, and Presidents of Historically Black Universities were small in number, composed of 5, 10, and 7 persons respectively, it is important to consider the four subgroups separately for attitudes and perceptions. The subgroup of Presidents of Historically White Universities was the largest subgroup (41), thus constituting the largest percentage (65%) of the total survey population. This factor was taken into consideration when reviewing the percentages of the total group of the four subgroups.

Table 2
Response of Subgroup: SHEEO'S
STATEMENT A: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES.

STATEMENT A	PERCENT RESPONDING			
COMPONENT	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE (Total)	DISA-GREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE (Total)
1. University Mission Statements	100.0	(100.0)		
2A. Closures/Mergers of Programs	40.0	60.0 (100.0)		
2B. Closures/Mergers of Universities	40.0	20.0 (60.0)	40.0	(40.0)
3. Admission Requirements	40.0	20.0 (60.0)	40.0	(40.0)
4. Alumni Views		20.0 (20.0)	60.0	20.0 (80.0)
5. Student Views	20.0	40.0 (60.0)	20.0	20.0 (40.0)
6. Program Offerings	60.0	40.0 (100.0)		
7. State's Financial Resources	40.0	60.0 (100.0)		
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources	40.0	60.0 (100.0)		
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity	60.0	20.0 (80.0)		20.0 (20.0)
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards	60.0	20.0 (80.0)		20.0 (20.0)

To statement A, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that the following areas are components of a state's or a university's desegregation policies," the 60% or more of the SHEEO subgroup strongly agreed or agreed that each area was a desegregation component with the exception of **Alumni Views**. Eighty percent (80%) of the responses from SHEEO's disagreed or strongly disagreed that **Alumni Views** was a component of desegregation policies.

Table 3

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT A: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES.

STATEMENT A	PERCENT RESPONDING			
COMPONENT	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE (Total)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE (Total)
1. University Mission Statements	55.6	44.4 (100%)		
2A. Closures/Mergers of Programs	20.0	40.0 (60.0)	40.0	(40.0)
2B. Closures/Mergers of Universities	20.0	50.0 (70.0)	20.0	10.0 (30.0)
3. Admission Requirements	50.0	30.0 (80.0)	10.0	10.0 (20.0)
4. Alumni Views	22.2	55.6 (77.8)	11.1	11.1 (22.2)
5. Student Views	22.2	66.7 (88.9)		11.1 (11.1)
6. Program Offerings	22.2	77.8 (100.0)		
7. State's Financial Resources	11.1	88.9 (100.0)		
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources	22.2	66.7 (88.9)	11.1	(11.1)
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity	22.2	66.7 (88.9)	11.1	(11.1)
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards	33.3	66.7 (100.0)		

To Statement A, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that the following areas are components of a state's or a university's desegregation policies," 60% or more of the Legislative Chairs strongly agreed or agreed that all areas are components of desegregation policies. Legislative chairs included **Alumni Views** as an area to be considered (Table 3).

Table 4

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT A: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES.

STATEMENT A	PERCENT RESPONDING			
COMPONENT	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE (Total)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE (Total)
1. University Mission Statements	61.0	26.8 (87.8)	9.8	2.4 (12.2)
2A. Closures/Mergers of Programs	15.0	45.0 (60.0)	32.5	7.5 (40.0)
2B. Closures/Mergers of Universities	10.0	42.5 (52.5)	35.0	12.5 (47.5)
3. Admission Requirements	39.0	36.6 (75.6)	14.6	9.8 (24.4)
4. Alumni Views	2.4	36.6 (39.0)	41.5	19.5 (61.0)
5. Student Views	7.3	56.1 (63.4)	29.3	7.3 (36.6)
6. Program Offerings	19.5	56.1 (75.6)	19.5	4.9 (24.4)
7. State's Financial Resources	24.4	39.0 (63.4)	24.4	12.2 (36.6)
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources	12.2	56.1 (68.3)	22.0	9.8 (31.8)
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity	4.9	41.5 (46.4)	34.1	19.5 (53.6)
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards	34.1	53.7 (87.8)	9.8	2.4 (12.2)

To Statement A, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that the following areas are components of a state's or a university's desegregation policies," Table 4 shows that Presidents of Historically White Universities strongly agreed or agreed that eight of the ten areas were components of desegregation policy by a positive response of 52.5% or more. Component #4, **Alumni Views,** was considered to be a component by only 39.0% of respondents. This view was held by SHEEO's but not by Legislative Chairs who responded that **Alumni Views** was a component.

Component #9, **Equity Funding for Past Disparity,** received a 46.4% positive response and a 53.6% negative response from Presidents of Historically White Universities. The 46.4% was a total of 4.9% who strongly agreed and 41.5% who agreed, with 34.1% who disagreed and 19.5% who strongly disagreed. Presidents of Historically White Universities (52.5%) agreed that **Closure/Mergers of Universities** was a component. Agreed and disagreed responses, by this subgroup, were 42.5 percent and 35 percent, respectively.

Table 5

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT A: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES.

STATEMENT A	PERCENT RESPONDING			
COMPONENT	STRONGLY AGREE	AGREE (Total)	DISAGREE	STRONGLY DISAGREE (Total)
1. University Mission Statements	71.4	28.6 (100.0)		
2A. Closures/Mergers of Programs	28.6	42.9 (71.5)	14.3	14.3 (28.6)
2B. Closures/Mergers of Universities	14.3	(14.3)		85.7 (85.7)
3. Admission Requirements	42.9	42.9 (85.8)	14.3	(14.3)
4. Alumni Views	33.3	16.7 (50.0)	50.0	(50.0)
5. Student Views	16.7	66.7 (83.4)	16.7	(16.7)
6. Program Offerings	71.4	28.6 (100.0)		
7. State's Financial Resources	83.3	16.7 (100.0)		
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources	42.9	57.1 (100.0)		
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity	100.0	(100.0)		
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards	100.0	(100.0)		

To Statement A, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that the following areas are components of a state's or a university's desegregation policies," Table 5 shows that Presidents of Historically Black Universities selected strongly agreed or agreed 100% to six out of ten components. Component #3, **Admission Requirements**, received an 85.8% positive response. Component #5, **Student Views**, received 83.4% positive responses and Component #2A, **Closure/Mergers of Programs**, received 71.5% positive responses.

Only Component #2B, **Closure/Mergers of Universities**, received a high negative response. This component received a 14.3% response to strongly agree and 85.7% to strongly disagree. This was the highest percentage of responses for strongly disagree of any component. Additionally, it was the highest percentage of negative responses when strongly disagree and disagree responses were totalled. The closest negative response to Statement A was an 80.0% negative response from SHEEO's on **Alumni Views**, when strongly disagree (20%) and disagree (60%) are totalled.

As a subgroup, Presidents of Historically Black Universities had the greatest amount of positive agreement with six components receiving 100% positive agreement, indicating either agree and/or strongly agree.

Alumni Views was a 50% split for the Presidents of Historically Black Universities' subgroup. Fifty percent (50%) disagreed, 33.3% strongly agreed, and 16.7% agreed for a total of 50.0% on the positive side.

In conclusion, the responses to Statement A by group as a whole and the four subgroups were as follows:

1. The majority of the total population agreed or strongly agreed that all areas, except **Alumni Views**, were components of a state's or university's desegregation policies.

2. The subgroups differed on the component of **Alumni Views,** with the majority of SHEEO's and Presidents of Historically White Universities responding disagree or strongly disagree and the majority of Legislative Chairs responding agree or strongly agree and an even split (50/50) occurring within the Presidents of Historically Black Universities.

3. The Presidents of Historically Black Universities responded with the strongest disagreement to any component in responding to the closure/merger of universities. 87.5% strongly disagreed with this component.

4. The SHEEO's and Presidents of Historically Black Universities' subgroups expressed more commonality with their respective subgroups. The Presidents of Historically White Universities as a subgroup expressed the most diversity in its responses.

5. Components #1, #6, and #7 received 100% strongly agree or agree responses from three of the four subgroups.

6. Components #8 and #10 received 100% strongly agree or agree responses from two of the four subgroups.

7. Component #4 received the lowest percentage of positive responses from SHEEO's and Historically White Universities. Component #2A received the lowest percentage of positive responses from Legislative Chairs. Component #2B received the lowest percentage of positive response from Presidents of Historically Black Universities.

8. The lowest percentage of positive responses on any one component from SHEEO's was 20%; from Legislative Chairs, 60.0%; from Presidents of Historically White Universities, 39.0%; and from Presidents of Historically Black Universities, 14.3%.

Table 6

Response of Total Subgroups, Positive Agreement
STATEMENT A: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES.

STATEMENT A	PERCENT RESPONDING			
COMPONENT	1	2	3	4
1. University Mission Statements	100.0	100.0	87.8	100.0
2A. Closures/Mergers of Programs	100.0	60.0	60.0	71.5
2B. Closures/Mergers of Universities	60.0	70.0	52.5	14.3
3. Admission Requirements	60.0	80.0	75.6	85.8
4. Alumni Views	20.0	77.8	39.0	50.0
5. Student Views	60.0	88.9	63.4	83.4
6. Program Offerings	100.0	100.0	75.6	100.0
7. State's Financial Resources	100.0	100.0	63.4	100.0
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources	100.0	88.9	68.3	100.0
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity	80.0	88.9	46.4	100.0
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards	80.0	100.0	87.8	100.0

Positive agreement is the total of strongly agree responses and agree responses. Table 6 depicts subgroups' responses of positive agreement. In the table, Subgroup 1 is comprised of SHEEO's; Subgroup 2 is comprised of Legislative Chairs; Subgroup 3 is comprised of Presidents of Historically White Universities; and Subgroup 4 is comprised of Presidents of Historically Black Universities.

Further analysis of subgroups' responses is shown as follows in Table 7.

Table 7

Analysis of Subgroups' Total Positive Responses
STATEMENT A: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES.

Component	SHEEO's	Legislative Chairs	Presidents of Historically White Universities	Presidents of Historically Black Universities
Analysis of Subgroups' Responses to **Closures/Mergers of Programs vis a vis Universities' Closure**				
Program Closure/Merger	100.0	60.0	60.0	71.5
Universities Closure	60.0	70.0	52.5	14.3
Analysis of Subgroups' Responses to **Alumni Views** vis a vis **Student Views**				
Alumni Views	20.0	77.8	39.0	50.0
Student Views	60.0	88.9	63.4	83.4
Analysis of Subgroups' Responses to Financial Components of **State and Financial Resources, Reallocation of Resources,** and **Equity Funding for Past Disparity**				
States' Financial Resources	100.0	100.0	63.4	100.0
Reallocation of Resources	100.0	88.9	68.3	100.0
Equity for Past Disparity	80.0	88.9	46.4	100.0

Statement B

Statement B: Please assess the extent to which you agree that these events have merit in accomplishing desegregation:

1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses
2. Other Race (Other Race Represents Black at Historically White Institutions; White at Historically Black Institutions
    - A. Scholarships
    - B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives (e.g. early tenure, paid moving expenses).
3. Across Universities
    - A. Equal Admissions
    - B. Equal Tuition

When combining extreme merit, high merit, merit, and some merit as positive responses, the following ranking occurs:

Event	Percent Positive
Other Race Scholarships	98.4
Other Race Faculty-Appointment Incentives	93.4
Across University Equal Admissions	80.6
Across University Equal Tuition	80.6
Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses	67.2

Table 8

Response of Total Group: SHEEO'S, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT B: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THESE EVENTS HAVE MERIT IN ACCOMPLISHING DESEGREGATION.

STATEMENT B					
EVENTS	EXTREME MERIT	HIGH MERIT	MERIT	SOME MERIT	NO MERIT
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses	3.3	14.8	14.8	34.4	32.8
2. Other Race					
A. Scholarships	35.5	32.3	24.2	6.5	1.6
B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives	26.2	34.4	26.2	6.6	6.6
3A. Across Universities: Equal Admissions	22.6	16.1	22.6	19.4	19.4
3B. Across Universities: Equal Tuition	22.6	17.7	22.6	17.7	19.4

As depicted in Table 8, all events received a majority of totalled positive merit responses. Event One, **Required Faculty Reassignment**, received the largest percentage (32.8%) of no merit responses, followed by Events 3A and 3B, **Equal Admissions and Equal Tuition Across Universities**, which received 19.4% no merit each. The event which received the least no merit responses was 2A **Other Race Scholarships** at 1.6% followed by 2B **Faculty Appointed Incentives** at 6.6% no merit responses.

Table 9

Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's
STATEMENT B: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE
THAT THESE EVENTS HAVE MERIT IN ACCOMPLISHING DESEGREGATION.

STATEMENT B					
EVENTS	EXTREME MERIT	HIGH MERIT	MERIT	SOME MERIT	NO MERIT
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses			50.0	25.0	25.0
2. Other Race					
A. Scholarships	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	
B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives	25.0	25.0	25.0	25.0	
3A. Across Universities: Equal Admissions			50.0	25.0	25.0
3B. Across Universities: Equal Tuition		25.0	50.0	25.0	

In Statement B, SHEEO's responded to only two events with no merit. The events were **Required Faculty Reassignment To Other Campuses** and **Equal Admissions Across Campuses** with a 25% no merit response to those two events. 2A, **Other Race Scholarships**, and 2B, **Other Race Faculty-Appointment Incentives**, received the only extreme merit of 25% each.

Table 10

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT B: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THESE EVENTS HAVE MERIT IN ACCOMPLISHING DESEGREGATION.

STATEMENT B					
EVENTS	EXTREME MERIT	HIGH MERIT	MERIT	SOME MERIT	NO MERIT
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses	10.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	10.0
2. Other Race					
A. Scholarships	20.0	30.0	50.0		
B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives	20.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	
3A. Across Universities: Equal Admissions	30.0	30.0	10.0	20.0	10.0
3B. Across Universities: Equal Tuition	30.0	20.0	20.0	10.0	20.0

Legislative Chairs' responses were mixed, reflecting little consensus as to degree of merit, but few responses were a negative no merit. 2A, **Scholarships**, received the most positive responses with 50.0% merit, 30.0% high merit, and 20.0% extreme merit. This event received no responses of some merit or no merit. The only other event which received no responses in the no merit rating was 2B, **Faculty Appointment Incentives.**

Table 11

Responses of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT B: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE
THAT THESE EVENTS HAVE MERIT IN ACCOMPLISHING DESEGREGATION.

STATEMENT B					
EVENTS	EXTREME MERIT	HIGH MERIT	MERIT	SOME MERIT	NO MERIT
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses	2.5	10.0	10.0	35.0	42.5
2. Other Race					
A. Scholarships	34.1	36.6	22.0	4.9	2.4
B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives	25.0	35.0	27.5	2.5	10.0
3A. Across Universities: Equal Admissions	26.8	14.6	22.0	12.2	24.4
3B. Across Universities: Equal Tuition	22.0	17.1	22.0	14.6	24.4

In Table 11, the response to Statement B of Presidents of Historically White Universities is depicted. This subgroup responded to every event by responding to every category of ranking and reflected little agreement. Event 1, **Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses,** received the highest no merit response of any subgroup at 42.5 %. Additionally, the presidents responded more than any other subgroup at some percent in no merit to each event. This was the only subgroup to have recorded no merit to every event. Event 2A, **Other Race Scholarships,** received a total positive response from the presidents of 97.6% (34.1% extreme merit, 36.6% high merit, 22.0% merit and 4.9% some merit. This subgroup reflected the largest amount of disagreement on which events and the level of merit that might accomplish desegregation when comparing the percentage responses to each event and at each level.

Table 12

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT B: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE
THAT THESE EVENTS HAVE MERIT IN ACCOMPLISHING DESEGREGATION.

STATEMENT B					
EVENTS	EXTREME MERIT	HIGH MERIT	MERIT	SOME MERIT	NO MERIT
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses		28.6		57.1	14.3
2. Other Race					
A. Scholarships	71.4	14.3		14.3	
B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3	
3A. Across Universities: Equal Admissions		14.3	28.6	57.1	
3B. Across Universities: Equal Tuition	28.6	14.3	14.3	42.9	

Table 12 depicts responses of Presidents of Historically Black Universities to Statement B. The Presidents of Historically Black Universities responded at the highest percentage (71.4%) to extreme merit for Event 2A, **Other Race Scholarships**. This subgroup had the most agreement within a subgroup. Additionally, the presidents had a larger degree of consensus overall. All events received positive merit responses except for Event 1, **Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses,** which received 14.3% no merit. The Presidents of Historically Black Universities appeared to give merit to all these events as ways to accomplish desegregation.

In conclusion, each of the four subgroups responded differently to the events and to the levels of merit. In Statement B, SHEEO's ranked the events which might have merit in accomplishing desegregation in the following order when totalling the positive merit responses:

2A. Other Race Scholarships (100.0%)
2B. Other Race Faculty Appointment Incentives (100.0%)
3B. Equal Tuition Across Universities (100.0%)
3A. Equal Admissions Across Universities (75.0%)
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses (75.0%)

Legislative Chairs ranked the events in Statement B which might have merit in accomplishing desegregation in the following order when totalling the positive merit responses:

2A. Other Race Scholarships (100.0%)
2B. Other Race Faculty Appointment Incentives (100.0%)
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses ((90.0%)
3A. Equal Admissions Across Universities (90.0%)
3B. Equal Tuition Across Universities (80.0%)

Presidents of Historically White Universities ranked the events in Statement B which might have merit in accomplishing desegregation in the following order when totalling the positive merit responses:

2A. Other Race Scholarships (97.6%)
2B. Other Race Faculty-Appointment Incentives (90.0%)
3A. Equal Admissions Across Universities (75.6%)
3B. Equal Tuition Across Universities (75.6%)
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses (57.5%)

Presidents of Historically Black Universities ranked the events in Statement B which might have merit in accomplishing desegregation in the following order when totalling the positive merit responses:

2A. Other Race Scholarships (100.0%)
2B. Other Race Faculty-Appointment Incentives (100.0%)
3B. Equal Tuition Across Universities (100.0%)
3A. Equal Admissions Across Universities (100.0%)
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses (85.7%)

Other Race Scholarships and **Other Race Faculty Appointment Incentives** were the two most popular events to accomplishing desegregation responded to by all four subgroups. The second most popular events but by a lesser degree, were **Equal Tuition** and **Equal Admissions Across Universities**. The least popular event, but receiving over 50.0 total positive responses from each subgroup, was **Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses**. Presidents of Historically White Universities recorded the most no merit responses to this event at 42.5%; the SHEEO's responded 25.0% no merit, the Presidents of Historically Black Universities responded 14.3% no merit and lastly, the Legislative Chairs responded 10.0% no merit.

Statement C

Statement C: Please assess the extent to which you feel the following are appropriate in a desegregated environment.

1. Single Race Institutions
2. Racial Quotas
3. Ethnic Studies

The responses to Statement C as a total group are given in Table 13.

Table 13

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT C: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE APPROPRIATE IN A DESEGREGATED ENVIRONMENT.

STATEMENT C	RESPONSES IN PERCENTAGE			
Component	Highly Appropriate	Appropriate	Somewhat Appropriate	Inappropriate
Single Race Institutions	3.2	7.9	14.3	74.6
Racial Quotas	1.6	7.9	36.5	54.0
Ethnic Studies	19.0	39.7	34.9	6.3

In Table 13, the group, as a whole, responded that **Ethnic Studies** is appropriate in a desegregated environment by 93.6%. The group responded that **Racial Quotas** are appropriate in a desegregated environment by 46.0% and inappropriate by 54.0%. The group, as a whole, responded that **Single Race Institutions** are appropriate in a desegregated environment by 25.4% and inappropriate by 74.6%. It is important to note that the majority of the responses to **Ethnic Studies** fell in appropriate (39.7%) and somewhat appropriate (34.9%); to **Racial Quotas** in somewhat appropriate (36.5%) and inappropriate (54.0%); and to single race institutions in inappropriate (74.6%). The individual subgroups responded as shown in Tables 14, 15, 16, and 17. The SHEEO's and Presidents of Historically White Universities responded 80% and 80.5%, respectively that **Single Race Institutions** were inappropriate in a desegregated environment. Sixty percent (60%) of the Legislative Chairs responded that **Single Race Institutions** were inappropriate in a desegregated environment. The Presidents of Historically Black Universities responded 57.1% that **Single Race Institutions** were inappropriate in a desegregated environment. This was the lowest percentage of the four subgroups and the Presidents of the Historically White Universities was the highest percentage of the subgroups.

The Presidents of Historically White Universities were the only subgroup to respond by a majority (68.3%) that **Racial Quotas** were inappropriate in a desegregated environment. The other three subgroups responded by a majority of each subgroup that racial quotas were somewhat appropriate. SHEEO's responded by 60.0%, Legislative Chairs responded 50.0%, and Presidents of Historically Black Universities responded by 57.1%.

Table 14

Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's
STATEMENT C: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE APPROPRIATE IN A DESEGREGATED ENVIRONMENT.

	Highly Appropriate	Appropriate	Somewhat Appropriate	Inappropriate
Single Race Institutions			20.0	80.0
Racial Quotes			60.0	40.0
Ethnic Studies	20.0	40.0	40.0	

Table 15

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT C: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE APPROPRIATE IN A DESEGREGATED ENVIRONMENT.

	Highly Appropriate	Appropriate	Somewhat Appropriate	Inappropriate
Single Race Institutions		10.0	30.0	60.0
Racial Quotes	10.0	20.0	50.0	20.0
Ethnic Studies	30.0	30.0	30.0	10.0

Table 16

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT C: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE APPROPRIATE IN A DESEGREGATED ENVIRONMENT.

	Highly Appropriate	Appropriate	Somewhat Appropriate	Inappropriate
Single Race Institutions	4.9	4.9	9.8	80.5
Racial Quotes		4.9	26.8	68.3
Ethnic Studies	9.8	43.9	39.0	7.3

Table 17

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT C: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE APPROPRIATE IN A DESEGREGATED ENVIRONMENT.

	Highly Appropriate	Appropriate	Somewhat Appropriate	Inappropriate
Single Race Institutions		28.6	14.3	57.1
Racial Quotes		14.3	57.1	28.6
Ethnic Studies	57.1	28.6	14.3	

Statement D

Statement D: Please assess the extent to which you feel these events have significantly improved desegregation efforts in higher education:

1. Department Actions of the U. S. Government
2. Integration in the Military
3. Desegregation of Public Schools
4. Lawsuits
   A. Adams versus Richardson
   B. Brown versus Board of Education
   C. Ayers versus Fordice

The group as a whole responded that these events had or had not significantly improved desegregation efforts in higher education, as shown in Table 18.

Table 18

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT D: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THESE EVENTS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVED DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

EVENTS	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Dept. Actions of the U.S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)	29.0	50.0	17.7	3.2
Integration in the Military	29.5	52.5	13.1	4.9
Desegregation of Public Schools	40.3	50.0	6.5	3.2
Lawsuits				
A. Adams versus Richardson	25.9	59.3	11.1	3.7
B. Brown versus Board of Education	48.3	48.3	3.3	
C. Ayers versus Fordice	12.5	48.2	33.9	5.4

The event which received the largest percentage and strongest agreement was 4B **Brown versus Board of Education**, at 48.3% responding strongly agree and 48.3% responding agree. The next event which received the strongest levels of agreement was

Desegregation of Public Schools at 40.3% strongly agree and 50% at agree.

All events received in excess of 50% positive agreement when strongly agree and agree were totalled as follows in rank order of impact.

Event	Percent Positive Agreement
4B. Brown versus Board of Education	96.3
3. Desegregation of Public Schools	90.3
4A. Adams versus Richardson	85.2
2. Integration in the Military	82.0
1. Department Actions of the U. S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)	79.0
4C. Ayers versus Fordice	60.7

The one event which received the largest negative response as to its impact on desegregation by the total group was event 4C **Ayers versus Fordice** at 33.9% disagree and 5.4% strongly disagree.

The subgroups responses to Statement D are shown in Tables 19, 20, 21 and 22.

Table 19

Response Of Subgroup: SHEEO's
STATEMENT D: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THESE EVENTS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVED DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

STATEMENT D	PERCENT			
EVENTS	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Dept. Actions of the U.S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)	40.0	40.0	20.0	
Integration in the Military	40.0	40.0	20.0	
Desegregation of Public Schools	60.0	40.0		
Lawsuits				
A. Adams versus Richardson	40.0	60.0		
B. Brown versus Board of Education	40.0	60.0		
C. Ayers versus Fordice	40.0	20.0	40.0	

Table 20

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT D: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THESE EVENTS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVED DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

STATEMENT D	PERCENT			
EVENTS	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Dept. Actions of the U.S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)	30.0	50.0	20.0	
Integration in the Military	20.0	60.0	20.0	
Desegregation of Public Schools	40.0	50.0		10.0
Lawsuits				
A. Adams versus Richardson	42.9	57.1		
B. Brown versus Board of Education	55.6	44.4		
C. Ayers versus Fordice	11.1	66.7	11.1	11.1

Table 21

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT D: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THESE EVENTS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVED DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

STATEMENT D	PERCENT			
EVENTS	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Dept. Actions of the U.S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)	25.0	50.0	20.0	5.0
Integration in the Military	30.0	52.5	12.5	5.0
Desegregation of Public Schools	37.5	55.0	7.5	
Lawsuits				
A. Adams versus Richardson	19.4	61.1	13.9	5.6
B. Brown versus Board of Education	43.6	51.3	5.1	
C. Ayers versus Fordice	8.6	48.6	40.0	2.9

Table 22

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT D: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THESE EVENTS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVED DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION.

STATEMENT D	PERCENT			
EVENTS	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
Dept. Actions of the U.S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)	42.9	57.1		
Integration in the Military	33.3	50.0		16.7
Desegregation of Public Schools	42.9	28.6	14.3	14.3
Lawsuits				
A. Adams versus Richardson	33.3	50.0	16.7	
B. Brown versus Board of Education	71.4	28.6		
C. Ayers versus Fordice	14.3	42.9	28.6	14.3

The SHEEO's subgroup responded positively to all events as significantly improving desegregation efforts in higher education by 80.0% or more except to 4C **Ayers versus Fordice,** which received a 40.0% response to disagree. The strongest positive agreement was to event 3, **Desegregation of the Public Schools,** which received a response rate of 60.0% strongly agree. SHEEO's recorded no strongly disagree to any event (Table 19).

The Legislative Chairs responded positively to all events as significantly improving desegregation efforts in higher education by 80% or more. Event 4B, **Brown versus Board of Education,** received the strongest positive agreement with a 55.6% strongly agree and 44.4% agree responses (Table 20).

The Presidents of Historically White Universities responded positively to six events as significantly improving desegregation efforts in higher education. 4C, **Ayers versus**

Fordice, received a 40.0% response of disagree. The presidents rated event 4B, **Brown versus Board of Education**, as the most positive event by responding 43.6% as strongly agree and 51.3% as agree (Table 21).

The subgroup Presidents of Historically Black Universities ranked event 4B, **Brown versus Board of Education,** and event 1, **Department Actions of the U. S. Government,** as the two events which most significantly improved desegregation efforts in higher education. They strongly agreed by a 71.4% and agreed by a 28.6% to the impact of 4B, **Brown versus Board of Education.** They strongly agreed by a 42.9% and agreed by a 57.1% to the impact of Event 1, **Department Actions of the U. S. Government**. This subgroup had over a 50% positive response to all events. One event, 4C **Ayers versus Fordice**, received a large negative response (42.9%).

The totalled response of the Presidents of Historically Black Universities in the disagree and strongly disagree categories was matched by the Presidents of Historically White Universities total negative response of 42.9% to the Ayers versus Fordice.

The subgroup, Presidents of Historically Black Universities, agreed with their fellow Presidents of the Historically White Universities by responding in the disagree and strongly disagree total by 42.9% to event 4C, **Ayers versus Fordice**, whether it significantly improved desegregation efforts in higher education.

Statement E

Statement E: Please assess the extent to which you feel the following are barriers to student/faculty/staff desegregation offers three options of incidents considered by some as barriers to desegregation. These barriers are

E1 Being a minority placed within a majority;
E2 Feeling of comfort in being in the majority; and
E3 Availability of a comparable social community.

The group, as a total, responded to Statement E in the following manner, as shown in Table 23:

Table 23

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs,
Presidents of Historically White Universities,
Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT E: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL
THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO DESEGREGATION:

E1 Being a minority placed with a majority
E2 Feelings of comfort in being in the majority
E3 Availability of a comparable social community

	Percent Response			
Barriers	Significant Barrier	Large Barrier	Slight Barrier	Not a Barrier
E1	9.7	22.6	50.0	17.7
E2	17.7	35.5	30.6	16.1
E3	24.6	39.3	16.4	19.7

In Table 23, the group, as a whole, ranked each option listed in Statement E (E1 - E3) as a barrier to desegregation in varying degrees. **E3, Availability of a comparable social community,** was ranked lowest as a barrier, with 80.3% of the group responding that it was a barrier, either significant, large or slight. Yet this barrier received the highest number of responses as a significant barrier (24.6%); and as a large barrier (39.3%.).

Of the total group, 82.3% responded that **E1, Being a minority placed within a majority,** was a barrier. Fifty percent (50%) of the group indicated that E1 was a slight barrier, and 22.6%, a large barrier.

Barrier **E2, Feelings of comfort in being in the majority**, received the highest percentage of responses (83.8%), indicating that it was a barrier to student/faculty/staff desegregation.

The results of the subgroups' individual responses to Statement E are shown in Tables 24, 25, 26, and 27.

Table 24

Subgroup: SHEEO'S
STATEMENT E: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL
THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO DESEGREGATION:

E1 Being a minority placed with a majority
E2 Feelings of comfort in being in the majority
E3 Availability of a comparable social community

	Percent Response			
Barriers	Significant Barrier	Large Barrier	Slight Barrier	Not a Barrier
E1		20.0	60.0	20.0
E2	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
E3		20.0	20.0	60.0

Table 24 depicts the responses of the SHEEO subgroup to Statement E. Sixty percent (60%) of the SHEEO subgroup responded that **E3, Availability of a comparable social community**, was not a barrier to student/faculty/staff desegregation. **E2, Feelings of comfort in being in the majority,** was the only barrier that the SHEEO subgroup perceived as a significant (20.0%) or large (40.0%) barrier to student/faculty/staff desegregation.

The SHEEO's held the opinion that **E1, Being a minority placed within a majority**, was a slight barrier, with a 60% response.

Table 25

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT E: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL
THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO DESEGREGATION:

E1	Being a minority placed with a majority
E2	Feelings of comfort in being in the majority
E3	Availability of a comparable social community

	Percent Response			
Barriers	Significant Barrier	Large Barrier	Slight Barrier	Not a Barrier
E1	30.0	40.0	20.0	10.0
E2	20.0	40.0	20.0	20.0
E3	30.0	40.0	20.0	10.0

The data in Table 25 reveals that the opinion of the subgroup Legislative Chairs, was that E1, E2, and E3 were all barriers to student/faculty/staff desegregation to some degree. The barriers **E1, Being a minority placed within a majority,** and **E3, Availability of a comparable social community,** received a 30% response as a significant barrier and 40.0% as a large barrier. The barrier **E2, Feelings of comfort in being in the majority,** rated lower on the scale, with 40.0 % of the subgroup responding that it was a large barrier and 20.0% rating the category separately as a significant barrier, slight barrier, and not a barrier.

Table 26

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT E: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL
THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO DESEGREGATION:

E1 Being a minority placed with a majority
E2 Feelings of comfort in being in the majority
E3 Availability of a comparable social community

	Percent Response			
Barriers	Significant Barrier	Large Barrier	Slight Barrier	Not a Barrier
E1	5.0	22.5	55.0	17.5
E2	17.5	37.5	32.5	12.5
E3	30.8	41.0	17.9	10.3

As depicted in Table 26, the subgroup Presidents of Historically White Universities responded that **E3, Availability of a comparable social community**, was the strongest barrier to student/faculty/staff desegregation. Of this subgroup, 30.8% responded that E3 was a significant barrier, and 41.0% rated it a large barrier. The barrier considered by these presidents to be second in importance was **E2, Feelings of comfort in being in the majority,** which 17.5% rated as a significant barrier; 37.5% as a large barrier; and 32.5% as a slight barrier to student/faculty/staff desegregation. **E1, Being a minority placed within a majority**, was considered by these presidents to be less of a barrier than the other barriers, with 55.0% responding that it was a slight barrier and 17.5% that it was not a barrier.

Table 27

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT E: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL
THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO DESEGREGATION:

E1 Being a minority placed with a majority
E2 Feelings of comfort in being in the majority
E3 Availability of a comparable social community

	Percent Response			
Barriers	Significant Barrier	Large Barrier	Slight Barrier	Not a Barrier
E1	14.3		57.1	28.6
E2	14.3	14.3	42.9	28.6
E3		42.9		57.1

Table 27 depicts responses to Statement E of the subgroup Presidents of Historically Black Universities. Of this subgroup, 57.1% responded that **E3, Availability of a comparable social community**, was not a barrier to student/faculty/staff desegregation, yet 42.9% responded that it was a large barrier.

The opinion of the Presidents of Historically Black Universities was that **E1, Being a minority placed within a majority,** was a slight barrier (57.1%); and that **E2, Feelings of comfort in being in the majority,** was a slight barrier (42.9%). Each of these barriers received responses from this subgroup ranging from 28.6% to 57.1% that it was not a barrier.

Overall, the SHEEO's (60%) and Presidents of Historically Black Universities (57.1%) agreed that **E3, Availability of a comparable social community,** was not a barrier to students/faculty/staff desegregation. The Legislative Chairs and Presidents of Historically White Universities were of the opinion that E3 was a barrier at some level.

Statement F

Statement F: Please assess the influence each of the following groups has had on desegregation efforts:

1. State Legislatures
2. Judicial Systems
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights
4. Governing Boards
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
6. Faculty
7. Presidents/CEO's
8. Alumni
9. Students
10. Interest & Special Groups
11. Individuals
12. Employers of Graduates

This group, as a whole, responded to Statement F in the following manner as shown in Table 28.

Table 28

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT F: PLEASE ASSESS THE INFLUENCE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS HAS HAD ON DESEGREGATION EFFORTS.

STATEMENT F	PERCENT RESPONDING				
GROUP	STRONG POSITIVE INFLUENCE	POSITIVE INFLUENCE	NO INFLUENCE	NEGATIVE INFLUENCE	STRONG NEGATIVE INFLUENCE
1. State Legislatures	11.3	30.6	24.2	30.6	3.2
2. Judicial Systems	38.1	55.6	4.8	1.6	
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights	33.3	54.0	6.3	6.3	
4. Governing Boards	9.7	51.6	27.4	9.7	1.6
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	10.3	43.1	34.5	6.9	5.2
6. Faculty	4.9	54.1	24.6	11.5	4.9
7. Presidents/CEO's	19.4	59.7	11.3	9.7	
8. Alumni	6.6	19.7	36.1	32.8	4.9
9. Students	8.1	41.9	33.9	16.1	
10. Interest & Special Groups	6.5	46.8	21.0	16.1	9.7
11. Individuals	16.1	38.7	30.6	8.1	6.5
12. Employers of Graduates	9.8	42.6	39.3	4.9	3.3

Statement F, "Please assess the influence each of the following groups has had on desegregation efforts," had two levels of positive response (Strong Positive and Positive), neutral response (No Influence), and two levels of negative response (Negative Influence and Strong Negative). For presentation purposes, the two positive levels were combined and the two negative levels were combined.

Table 29 reflects positive, neutral, and negative responses of the group as a whole.

Table 29

Response of Groups Combined: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT F: PLEASE ASSESS THE INFLUENCE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS HAS HAD ON DESEGREGATION EFFORTS.

STATEMENT F	PERCENT RESPONDING		
GROUP	STRONG POSITIVE AND POSITIVE INFLUENCE	NO INFLUENCE	NEGATIVE AND STRONG NEGATIVE
1. State Legislatures	41.9	24.2	33.8
2. Judicial Systems	93.7	4.8	1.6
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights	87.3	6.3	6.3
4. Governing Boards	61.3	27.4	11.3
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	53.4	34.5	12.1
6. Faculty	59.0	24.6	16.4
7. Presidents/CEO's	79.1	11.3	9.7
8. Alumni	26.3	36.1	37.7
9. Students	50.0	33.9	16.1
10. Interest & Special Groups	53.3	21.0	25.8
11. Individuals	54.8	30.6	14.6
12. Employers of Graduates	52.4	39.3	8.2

A rank order of groups' influence on desegregation efforts using the combined strong positive influence and positive influence placed ten (10) of the twelve groups with positive responses of 50.0% or more, as follows:

Group	**Combined Positives**
Judicial System	93.7%
U.S. Office of Civil Rights	87.3%
Presidents/CEO's	79.1%
Governing Boards	61.3%
Faculty	59.0%
Individuals	54.8%
SHEEO's	53.4%
Interest & Special Groups	53.3%
Employers of Graduates	52.4%
Students	50.0%

As shown in Table 29, the two groups which did not fall within the positive range were **Alumni** at 26.3% combined positive responses and **State Legislatures** at 41.9% combined positive responses. These two groups received the highest number of combined negative responses of the twelve groups.

Alumni received 37.7% combined negative responses and **State Legislatures** received 33.8% negative responses. The group thought to have the closest negative influence to **Alumni** and **State Legislatures** was **Interest and Special Groups** at 25.8% combined negative.

The group which reflected the most diverse response as to its influence of the twelve (12) groups was **Alumni**. **Alumni** received 26.3% combined positive response, 36.1% no influence, and 37.7% combined negative influence.

The four subgroups' responses to Statement F, "Please assess the influence each of the following groups has had on desegregation efforts," are presented in Tables 30, 31, 32, and 33.

Table 30

Response of Subgroup: SHEEO'S
STATEMENT F: PLEASE ASSESS THE INFLUENCE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS HAS HAD ON DESEGREGATION EFFORTS.

STATEMENT F	PERCENT RESPONDING				
GROUP	**STRONG POSITIVE INFLUENCE**	**POSITIVE INFLUENCE**	**NO INFLUENCE**	**NEGATIVE INFLUENCE**	**STRONG NEGATIVE INFLUENCE**
1. State Legislatures		40.0	40.0	20.0	
2. Judicial Systems		80.0	20.0		
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights		80.0	20.0		
4. Governing Boards	20.0	80.0			
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	20.0	60.0	20.0		
6. Faculty	50.0	25.0	25.0		
7. Presidents/CEO's	20.0	60.0			20.0
8. Alumni		40.0	20.0	40.0	
9. Students		40.0	40.0	20.0	
10. Interest & Special Groups		40.0	40.0		20.0
11. Individuals	20.0		40.0	40.0	
12. Employers of Graduates	20.0	20.0	60.0		

Table 31

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT F: PLEASE ASSESS THE INFLUENCE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS HAS HAD ON DESEGREGATION EFFORTS.

STATEMENT F	PERCENT RESPONDING				
GROUP	**STRONG POSITIVE INFLUENCE**	**POSITIVE INFLUENCE**	**NO INFLUENCE**	**NEGATIVE INFLUENCE**	**STRONG NEGATIVE INFLUENCE**
1. State Legislatures	20.0	30.0	30.0	20.0	
2. Judicial Systems	60.0	40.0			
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights	70.0	30.0			
4. Governing Boards	10.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	10.0	50.0	20.0	20.0	
6. Faculty		40.0	60.0		
7. Presidents/CEO's		40.0	50.0	10.0	
8. Alumni	10.0	30.0	30.0	30.0	
9. Students	20.0	40.0	30.0	10.0	
10. Interest & Special Groups	22.2	44.4	33.3		
11. Individuals	22.2	22.2	55.6		
12. Employers of Graduates	22.2	22.2	55.6		

Table 32

Response of Subgroup: Presidents - Historically White Universities
STATEMENT F: PLEASE ASSESS THE INFLUENCE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS HAS HAD ON DESEGREGATION EFFORTS.

STATEMENT F	PERCENT RESPONDING				
GROUP	STRONG POSITIVE INFLUENCE	POSITIVE INFLUENCE	NO INFLUENCE	NEGATIVE INFLUENCE	STRONG NEGATIVE INFLUENCE
1. State Legislatures	7.5	30.0	20.0	37.5	5.0
2. Judicial Systems	39.0	53.7	4.9	2.4	
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights	24.4	58.5	7.3	9.8	
4. Governing Boards	7.3	48.8	34.1	9.8	
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	5.3	42.1	42.1	5.3	5.3
6. Faculty	2.5	60.0	17.5	12.5	7.5
7. Presidents/CEO's	22.5	65.0	5.0	7.5	
8. Alumni	2.6	12.8	41.0	35.9	7.7
9. Students	5.0	40.0	37.5	17.5	
10. Interest & Special Groups	4.9	46.3	19.5	19.5	9.8
11. Individuals	17.1	43.9	26.8	4.9	7.3
12. Employers of Graduates	7.5	47.5	35.0	5.0	5.0

Table 33

Subgroup: Presidents - Historically Black Universities

STATEMENT F: PLEASE ASSESS THE INFLUENCE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS HAS HAD ON DESEGREGATION EFFORTS.

STATEMENT F	PERCENT RESPONDING				
GROUP	STRONG POSITIVE INFLUENCE	POSITIVE INFLUENCE	NO INFLUENCE	NEGATIVE INFLUENCE	STRONG NEGATIVE INFLUENCE
1. State Legislatures	28.6	28.6	28.6	14.3	
2. Judicial Systems	28.6	71.4			
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights	57.1	42.9			
4. Governing Boards	16.7	50.0	16.7		16.7
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	40.0	20.0	20.0		20.0
6. Faculty	28.6	42.9	14.3	14.3	
7. Presidents/CEO's	28.6	57.1		14.3	
8. Alumni	28.6	28.6	28.6	14.3	
9. Students	14.3	57.1	14.3	14.3	
10. Interest & Special Groups		57.1		28.6	14.3
11. Individuals		57.1	14.3	14.3	14.3
12. Employers of Graduates		57.1	28.6	14.3	

Statement G

Statement G: Please assess the change in attitudes toward the continued process of desegregation in the following geographical locations:

1. Nationally
2. Regionally
3. State

The public policy-makers responded as a group to Statement G as reflected in Table 34.

Table 34

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT G: PLEASE ASSESS THE CHANGE IN ATTITUDES DURING THE LAST 17 YEARS TOWARD DESEGREGATION IN THE FOLLOWING GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS

STATEMENT G	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
Nationally	1.6	74.2	24.2	
Regionally	3.2	71.0	25.8	
State	3.2	74.2	22.6	

The group, as a whole, responded 74% to the change of attitudes toward desegregation in the positive, either extremely positive or positive. They ranked the positive change in the order of **State (77.4), Nationally (75.8), and Regionally (74.2).**

The individual subgroups responded as shown in Tables 35, 36, 37, and 38.

Table 35

Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's
STATEMENT G: PLEASE ASSESS THE CHANGE IN ATTITUDES DURING THE LAST 17 YEARS TOWARD DESEGREGATION IN THE FOLLOWING GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS

Statement G	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
Nationally		100.0		
Regionally		100.0		
State		100.0		

The SHEEO subgroup Table 35 responded 100.0% that attitudes toward desegregation were changing for the positive in all three geographical regions.

Table 36

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT G: PLEASE ASSESS THE CHANGE IN ATTITUDES DURING THE LAST 17 YEARS TOWARD DESEGREGATION IN THE FOLLOWING GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS

STATEMENT G	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
Nationally		80.0	20.0	
Regionally		70.0	30.0	
State		80.0	20.0	

Table 36 shows the Legislative Chairs were divided on the direction of attitudes toward desegregation. Seventy percent (70%) or more were of the opinion that the attitudes were positive on the **Regional** level and 80% or more were of the opinion that on the **National** and **State** levels the attitudes were positive. There was a minority (30%

or less) of Legislative Chairs who were of the opinion that the attitudes toward desegregation were negative.

Table 37

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT G: PLEASE ASSESS THE CHANGE IN ATTITUDES DURING THE LAST 17 YEARS TOWARD DESEGREGATION IN THE FOLLOWING GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS

STATEMENT G	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
Nationally		72.5	27.5	
Regionally	2.5	72.5	25.0	
State	2.5	75.0	22.5	

The majority of the Presidents of Historically White Universities responded that attitudes toward desegregation were changing for the positive at all three levels. Seventy-five percent (75%) responded that the attitudes for **Regional** and **State** were positive and 2.5% extremely positive. **Regional Attitudes** were indicated at 72.5% positive and 2.5% extremely positive by this subgroup. The **National Attitudes** were thought positive by 72.5% of the Presidents of Historically White Schools (Table 37).

Table 38

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT G: PLEASE ASSESS THE CHANGE IN ATTITUDES DURING THE LAST 17 YEARS TOWARD DESEGREGATION IN THE FOLLOWING GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS

STATEMENT G	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
Nationally	14.3	57.1	28.6	
Regionally	14.3	42.9	42.9	
State	14.3	42.9	42.9	

The Presidents of Historically Black Universities (14.3%) responded that **Nationally, Regionally, and State** attitudes were extremely positive (Table 38).

There was a strong opinion (71.4%) when combining extremely positive 14.3% and positive 57.1% that the **National** attitudes were positive, yet there was less support expressed regarding the **Regional and State** attitudes. The Presidents of Historically Black Universities (57.2%) believed that the **State** and **Regional** attitudes were changing in the positive direction. By a 42.9% response, these presidents expressed the opinion that **Regional** and **State** attitudes were changing to the negative direction.

In summary, Statement G received mixed responses from the subgroups. As a total group each location received positive or extremely positive in excess of 74.2%. The Presidents of Historically White Universities subgroup was most like the total group with 72.5% and greater responding with a positive or extremely positive. The SHEEO's were the subgroup which responded with the most agreement. One hundred percent (100%) of the SHEEO's felt the attitudes at all three levels were positive. The Presidents of

Historically Black Universities responded with the highest percentage of negative responses. They indicated by 42.9% that attitudes on the **Regional** and **State** levels were changing to the negative. No subgroup responded extremely negative to any level.

Statement H

Statement H: Please assess attitudes toward more extensive desegregation within various groups:

1. Alumni
2. Students
3. Faculty
4. Presidents
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)
6. Political Leaders
7. Special Interest Groups

The group, as a whole, responded to Statement H as presented in Table 39.

Table 39

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents, Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
1. Alumni	8.2	37.7	45.9	8.2
2. Students	11.5	60.7	23.0	4.9
3. Faculty	11.5	68.9	16.4	3.3
4. Presidents	29.0	59.7	11.3	
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	11.9	78.0	10.2	
6. Political Leaders	8.2	50.8	36.1	4.9
7. Special Interest Groups	13.3	51.7	20.0	15.0

Adding the extremely positive and positive responses provided a combined positive response. Adding the negative and extremely negative responses provided a combined negative response. This allowed a ranking in positive or negative order of the various groups' attitudes toward more extensive desegregation.

Table 40

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
Combined Positive and Negatives
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Percentage Totalled	
Group	Extremely Positive/ Positive	Extremely Negative/ Negative
1. Alumni	45.9	54.1
2. Student	72.2	27.9
3. Faculty	80.4	19.7
4. Presidents	88.7	11.3
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	89.9	10.2
6. Political Leaders	59.0	41.0
7. Special Interest Groups	65.0	35.0

The public policy-makers, as a whole, ranked the groups as follows:

SHEEO's	89.9% Positive
Presidents	88.7% Positive
Faculty	80.4% Positive
Students	72.2% Positive
Special Interest Groups	65.0% Positive
Political Leaders	59.0% Positive
Alumni	45.9% Positive

The group, as a whole, held the opinion (54.1%) that **Alumni** attitudes are negative toward more extensive desegregation. The highest combined positive responses to more extensive desegregation was thought to be by those groups involved with higher education on a daily basis. These were the **SHEEO's, Presidents, Faculty** and **Students**. The external groups of **Special Interest Groups, Political Leaders and Alumni** were ranked as having less positive attitudes toward more extensive desegregation.

The subgroup SHEEO's responded to the Statement H, "Please assess attitudes toward more extensive desegregation" as shown in Table 41.

Table 41

Response of Subgroup: SHEEO's
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
1. Alumni		40.0	60.0	
2. Students		60.0	40.0	
3. Faculty		100.0		
4. Presidents		100.0		
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)		100.0		
6. Political Leaders		60.0	40.0	
7. Special Interest Groups	20.0	40.0	40.0	

In Table 41, sixty percent (60.0%) of the SHEEO's held the opinion that **Alumni** attitudes toward more extensive desegregation are negative. Forty percent (40.0%) of the SHEEO's held the opinion that **Students, Political Leaders,** and **Special Interest Groups'** attitudes toward more extensive desegregation are negative. All other responses were positive or extremely positive, with 100% consensus, regarding three of the four groups. They were 100% positive regarding attitudes toward more extensive desegregation of **Faculty, Presidents**, and Themselves **(SHEEO)**. When ranking most positive to least positive, the groups were as follows:

Faculty	100% Positive
Presidents	100% Positive
SHEEO's	100% Positive
Special Interest Groups	60% Positive
Political Leaders	60% Positive
Students	60% Positive
Alumni	40% Positive

Table 42

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
1. Alumni	11.1	33.3	44.4	11.1
2. Students	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1
3. Faculty	11.1	55.6	22.2	11.1
4. Presidents	11.1	66.7	22.2	
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	22.2	66.7	11.1	
6. Political Leaders	33.3	11.1	55.6	
7. Special Interest Groups	22.2	66.7	11.1	

Legislative Chairs were divided in their responses to Statement H which assessed the attitudes of groups toward more extensive desegregation. When combining the positive and combining the negatives the Legislative Chairs responded as shown in Table 43.

Table 43

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Percentage	
Group	Extremely Positive/ Positive	Extremely Negative/ Negative
1. Alumni	44.4	55.5
2. Student	66.7	33.3
3. Faculty	66.7	33.3
4. Presidents	77.8	22.2
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	88.9	11.1
6. Political Leaders	44.4	55.6
7. Special Interest Groups	88.9	11.1

Table 43 depicts the responses of Legislative Chairs to Statement H. As a subgroup, the Legislative Chairs held the opinion that **Special Interest Groups** and **SHEEO's** were the most positive groups toward more extensive desegregation. Of the Legislative Chairs, 88.9% held this opinion and 77.8% responded that Presidents were positive toward more extensive desegregation. **Students** and **Faculty** each received a 66.7% positive response. Legislative Chairs held the perception that their peers of **Political Leaders** and **Alumni** were the most negative toward more extensive desegregation. Legislative Chairs were most divided on **Political Leaders'** attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. 33.3% felt **Political Leaders'** attitudes were extremely positive, while 11.1% felt the attitudes were positive, and 55.6% felt the attitudes were negative.

The Presidents of Historically White Universities responded to Statement H "Please assess attitudes toward more extensive desegregation within various groups" responded as follows in Table 44.

Table 44

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD
MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
1. Alumni		42.5	50.0	7.5
2. Students	5.0	67.5	22.5	5.0
3. Faculty	7.5	75.0	15.0	2.5
4. Presidents	37.1	58.5	9.8	
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	10.3	79.5	10.3	
6. Political Leaders	2.5	65.0	25.0	7.5
7. Special Interest Groups	10.3	53.8	20.5	15.4

The Presidents of Historically White schools rated the attitudes of **Alumni** toward more extensive desegregation as negative (50.0%) and extremely negative (7.5%). This was the only group which a majority of the presidents held the opinion that the attitudes toward more extensive desegregation were negative. This subgroup rated their peer **Presidents** as the group with the most extremely positive (37.1%) attitudes toward more extensive desegregation.

Additionally, when the extremely positive and the positive responses were combined, a rank order was created as to those groups which the presidents felt were more positive.

The rank order from most combined positive responses were as follows:

Presidents	95.6% Combined Positive
SHEEO's	89.8% Combined Positive
Faculty	82.5% Combined Positive
Students	72.5% Combined Positive
Political Leaders	67.5% Combined Positive
Special Interest Groups	64.1% Combined Positive
Alumni	42.5% Combined Positive

Of the seven groups, the presidents gave the largest percent positive response to the three internal groups of a campus. These were the **Presidents, SHEEO's**, and **Faculty**.

The subgroup of Presidents of Historically Black Universities rated the specified groups attitudes toward more extensive desegregation as reflected in Table 45.

Table 45

Response of Group: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Percentage			
	Extremely Positive	Positive	Negative	Extremely Negative
1. Alumni	57.1	14.3	14.3	14.3
2. Students	57.1	28.6	14.3	
3. Faculty	42.9	28.6	28.6	
4. Presidents	57.1	28.6	14.3	
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	16.7	66.7	16.7	
6. Political Leaders	14.3	14.3	71.4	
7. Special Interest Groups	14.3	28.6	14.3	42.9

As shown in Table 45, a majority of the Presidents of Historically Black Universities rated extremely positive (57.1%) three of the groups' attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. These groups were **Alumni**, **Students**, and their peer **Presidents**. The group which received a 71.4% response of negative attitudes toward more extensive desegregation was **Political Leaders**.

A combined extremely positive and positive allowed a rank order to be determined for Statement H. The Presidents of Historically Black Universities ranked from most combined positive responses to least combined positive responses as follows:

Students	85.7% Combined Positive
Presidents	85.7% Combined Positive
SHEEO	83.4% Combined Positive

Faculty	71.5% Combined Positive
Alumni	71.4% Combined Positive
Special Interest Groups	42.9% Combined Positive
Political Leaders	28.6% Combined Positive

The subgroup of Presidents of Historically Black Universities ranked two of the seven groups as having negative attitudes toward more extensive desegregation of higher education. They were **Special Interest Groups** and **Political Leaders**.

In summary, Statement H "Please assess attitudes toward more extensive desegregation within various groups" presented the following rank table by subgroup using combined positive and combined negatives (Table 46).

Table 46

Combined Positive Responses by Subgroup
STATEMENT H: PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS.

STATEMENT H	Totalled Percentage Positive			
	SHEEO's	LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS	HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS	HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITY PRESIDENTS
1. Alumni	40.0	44.4	42.5	71.4
2. Students	60.0	66.7	72.5	85.7
3. Faculty	100.0	66.7	82.5	71.5
4. Presidents	100.0	77.8	95.6	85.7
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	100.0	88.9	89.8	83.4
6. Political Leaders	60.0	44.4	67.5	28.6
7. Special Interest Groups	60.0	88.9	64.1	42.9

Table 46 shows that SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, and Presidents of Historically White Universities held the opinion that **Alumni** have negative attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. Presidents of Historically Black Universities expressed that **Alumni** have a positive attitude toward more extensive desegregation.

Legislative Chairs and Presidents of Historically Black Universities held the opinion that **Political Leaders** have negative attitudes toward more extensive desegregation.

Legislative chairs (88.9%) ranked **Special Interest Groups** positive while presidents of Historically White Universities (64.1%) and Presidents of Historically Black Universities (42.9%) ranked this group near the bottom. SHEEO's (100%) as a subgroup, held the opinion that they had attitudes that were positive toward more extensive desegregation. Legislative Chairs (55.6%) as a subgroup, held the opinion that **Political Leaders** had negative attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. Presidents of Historically Black Universities (71.4%) agreed with the Legislative Chairs that **Political Leaders** had negative attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. SHEEO's (60.0%) and Presidents of Historically White Universities (67.5%) held the opposite opinion. Their opinion was that **Political Leaders** have positive attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. The Presidents of Historically White Institutions (95.6%) and the Presidents of Historically Black Institutions (85.7%) expressed the opinion that their peer **Presidents** held positive attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. SHEEO's (100%) agreed with the Presidents that **Presidents** held positive attitudes toward more extensive desegregation. Legislative Chairs (77.8%) agreed by a smaller percentage that **Presidents** did hold positive attitudes toward more extensive desegregation.

Statement I

Statement I: Please assess the extent to which you agree that the efforts to desegregate higher education are in crisis.

The following responses resulted from the surveyed group as shown in Table 47.

Table 47

Response of Group: SHEEO'S, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT I: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE EFFORTS TO DESEGREGATE HIGHER EDUCATION ARE IN CRISIS.

STATEMENT I	Percentage			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SHEEO'S	20.0	40.0	40.0	
Legislative Chairs	30.0	50.0	20.0	
Presidents, Historically White Universities	17.1	36.6	36.6	9.8
Presidents, Historically Black Universities	42.9	42.9	14.3	
Total Group	22.2	39.7	31.7	6.3

In Table 47, the subgroup Presidents of Historically Black Universities (85.8%) felt that the efforts to desegregate higher education were in crisis. Legislative Chairs (80.0%) also agreed that a crisis did exist. SHEEO's (60.0%) to a lessor degree believed there was a crisis, and by a small majority (53.7%) the Presidents of Historically White Universities held the opinion that a crisis existed.

Of the Presidents of Historically Black Universities, 42.9% strongly agreed that a crisis existed and an equal number at 42.9% agreed. This subgroup of Presidents of Historically

Black Universities recorded the largest percentage of strongly agree of the four subgroups.

Statement J

Statement J: Please assess the extent to which the following individuals spend their time on desegregation issues:

1. Presidents
2. Legislators
3. State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff

Statement J resulted in the following group's responses as reflected in Table 48.

Table 48

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Presidents, Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT J: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS SPEND THEIR TIME ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES.

STATEMENT J	Percentage			
	Significant Time	Much Time	Little Time	No Time
Presidents	15.9	55.6	27.0	1.6
Legislative Chairs	3.2	17.7	74.2	4.8
State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff	11.1	50.8	38.1	

As a group, **Presidents** (55.6%) were thought to spend much time on desegregation issues; **State Governing Boards, SHEEO's, Staff** (50.8%) were thought to spend much time on desegregation issues; while **Legislators** (74.2%) were thought to spend little time (Table 48).

The individual subgroups responded as reflected in Tables 49, 50, 51, and 52.

Table 49

Subgroup: SHEEO's
STATEMENT J: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS SPEND THEIR TIME ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES.

STATEMENT J	Percentage			
	Significant Time	Much Time	Little Time	No Time
Presidents	20.0	60.0	20.0	
Legislative Chairs			100.0	
State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff	20.0	80.0		

Table 50

Response of Subgroup: Legislative Chairs
STATEMENT J: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS SPEND THEIR TIME ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES.

STATEMENT J	Percentage			
	Significant Time	Much Time	Little Time	No Time
Presidents		40.0	60.0	
Legislative Chairs		30.0	70.0	
State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff	10.0	60.0	30.0	

Table 51

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically White Universities
STATEMENT J: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS SPEND THEIR TIME ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES.

STATEMENT J	Percentage			
	Significant Time	Much Time	Little Time	No Time
Presidents	17.1	61.0	19.5	2.4
Legislative Chairs	2.5	20.0	70.0	7.5
State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff	9.8	46.3	43.9	

Table 52

Response of Subgroup: Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT J: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS SPEND THEIR TIME ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES.

STATEMENT J	Percentage			
	Significant Time	Much Time	Little Time	No Time
Presidents	28.6	42.9	28.6	
Legislative Chairs	14.3		85.7	
State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff	14.3	42.9	42.9	

As a subgroup, **SHEEO's** (100%) held the opinion that they spend significant time (20.0%) or much time (60.0%) on desegregation efforts (Table 49). Legislative chairs (70.0%) held the opinion that **SHEEO's** did spend significant time (10.0%) or much time (60.0%) on these issues (Table 50). The presidents agreed but to a smaller degree. The Presidents of Historically White Universities (56.1%) responded that **SHEEO's** spend significant time (9.8%) or much time (46.3%) on desegregation issues; whereas the

Presidents of Historically Black Universities (57.2%) held that SHEEO's spend significant time (14.3%) or much time (42.9%) on desegregation issues (Table 52).

Legislative Chairs, as a subgroup, rated **Legislators** as spending much time (30.0%) or little time (70.0%) on desegregation (Table 50). **SHEEO's** responded by 100% that **Legislators** spend little time on these issues (Table 49). The majority of Presidents of Historically White Universities (70.0%) responded that **Legislators** spend little time on desegregation issues. A larger majority of the Presidents of Historically Black Universities (85.7%) stated that the **Legislators** spend little time on desegregation issues. (Table 50)

The majority of the Presidents of Historically White Universities reported they spend much time (61.0%) or significant time (17.1%) on desegregation issues (Table 51). The majority of Presidents of Black Universities reported they spend significant time (28.6%) or much time (42.9%) on these issues (Table 52).

The SHEEO's agreed that **Presidents** spend a large amount of time on desegregation issues (significant time (20%)) and much time (60.0%) (Table 49). Legislative Chairs, by a majority, did not agree that Presidents spend a large amount of time on desegregation efforts. Legislative Chairs reported that they had the opinion that Presidents spent much time (40.0%) or little time (60.0%) (Table 50).

Statement K

Statement K: Please assess the amount of time you spend on desegregation issues.

An analysis of the responses of the groups is given in Table 53.

Table 53
Response of Subgroups: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT K: PLEASE ASSESS THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU SPEND ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES.

Subgroup	Significant Time	Much Time	Little Time	No Time
SHEEO's	40.0	60.0		
Legislative Chairs	10.0	20.0	70.0	
Presidents of Historically White Universities	24.4	58.5	17.1	
Presidents of Historically Black Universities	71.4	14.3	14.3	

The SHEEO's responded that they spend significant time (40.0%) or much time (60.0%) on desegregation issues. This compared favorably to the opinion SHEEO's subgroup held regarding the amount of time SHEEO's spend on desegregation issues. Twenty percent (20%) of SHEEO's had the perception that SHEEO's as a group spend significant time, and 80.0% of the SHEEO's had the perception that SHEEO's as a group spend much time on desegregation issues (Table 49). The perception of the other three subgroups did not compare favorably to the SHEEO's response of how much time the they actually spend on desegregation issues. Thirty percent (30%) of Legislative Chairs (Table 50), 43.9% of Presidents of Historically White Universities (Table 51) and 42.9%

of Presidents of Historically Black Universities (Table 52) held the opinion that SHEEO's spend little time on desegregation issues.

The Legislative Chairs responded that they spend significant time (10.0%), much time (20.0%) or little time (70.0%) on desegregation issues (Table 53).

The other three subgroups' perceptions more favorably matched the actual response from the Legislative Chairs. They agreed that legislators spend little time on desegregation issues, but two subgroups felt Legislative Chairs spend even less time than the Legislative Chairs report that they spend. The SHEEO's responded 100.0% (Table 49); Presidents of Historically White Universities responded 70.0% (Table 51); and Presidents of Historically Black Universities responded 85.7% (Table 52) that Legislative Chairs spend little time on desegregation issues.

The Presidents of Historically White Universities responded that they actually spend significant time (24.4%), much time (58.5%), or little time (17.1%) on desegregation issues (Table 53). The SHEEO's and Presidents of Historically Black Universities subgroups hold a perception somewhat comparable. The one subgroup where the perception is different is Legislative Chairs. The Legislative Chairs (60.0%) have the perception that university presidents spend little time on desegregation issues (Table 50). The presidents as a group (82.9%) responded much or significant time (Table 53) was spent on desegregation issues.

The Presidents of Historically Black Universities reported that they spend significant time (71.4%), much time (14.3%) or little time (14.3%) (Table 53). This was the subgroup which, when compared to other subgroups, reported spending the highest percentage of their time on desegregation issues. They report spending significant time (71.4%) on these issues. A total of significant time responses (71.4%) and much time responses (14.3%) yields a combined 85.7% of Presidents of Historically Black Universities who were spending a large amount of time on desegregation issues (Table 53). Only the Legislative Chair subgroup held a significantly different opinion. The Legislative Chairs by 60.0% had the perception that university presidents spend little time on desegregation issues (Table 50). The other two subgroups responded that presidents spend much time on desegregation issues, but the Presidents of Historically Black Universities report spending significant time (Table 53).

All four subgroups agreed that a large amount of time was spent on desegregation issues by SHEEO's, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Presidents of Historically Black Universities. The actual responses reported an even larger amount of time was spent on desegregation efforts than perceived, with the Presidents of Historically Black Universities reporting the largest amount of time spent on these efforts.

Statement L

Statement L: Please assess the extent to which you agree that desegregation of higher education has significantly resulted in moving African Americans into the mainstream of society.

These resulted in the responses as reflected in Table 54.

Table 54

Response of Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities
STATEMENT L: PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT DESEGREGATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAS SIGNIFICANTLY RESULTED IN MOVING AFRICAN AMERICANS INTO THE MAINSTREAM OF SOCIETY.

STATEMENT L	Percentage			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SHEEO'S	40.0	40.0	20.0	
Legislative Chairs	20.0	40.0	40.0	
Presidents, Historically White Universities	17.5	77.5	5.0	
Presidents, Historically Black Universities	28.6	28.6	42.9	
Total Group	21.0	62.9	16.1	

The data in Table 54 indicates there is a wide differential between the opinions of Presidents of Historically White Universities and their peers in the Historically Black Universities as to whether higher education has moved African Americans into the mainstream. Of the Historically White University Presidents, 95% agree (77.5%) or strongly agree (17.5%) that this is the case, but only 57.2% of the Presidents of Historically Black Universities believe this to be the case. The Presidents of Historically

Black Universities strongly agree (28.6%) or agree (28.6%) with this statement. No subgroup registered any response to strongly disagree. A majority of SHEEO's (80.0%) and Legislative Chairs (60.0%) did feel that higher education had a positive impact on mainstreaming African Americans.

Statement M

Statement M: Please assess the extent to which you agree that desegregation of higher education has resulted in acceptance of cultural diversity by individuals on desegregated campuses.

This resulted in the responses shown on Table 55.

Table 55

Group: SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities, Presidents of Historically Black Universities

STATEMENT M:PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT DESEGREGATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAS RESULTED IN ACCEPTANCE OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY BY INDIVIDUALS ON DESEGREGATED CAMPUSES.

STATEMENT M	Percentage			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
SHEEO'S	20.0	60.0	20.0	
Legislative Chairs	10.0	50.0	40.0	
Presidents, Historically White Universities	10.0	67.5	22.5	
Presidents, Historically Black Universities		66.7	33.3	
Total Group	9.8	63.9	26.2	

No subgroup strongly disagreed that higher education had resulted in acceptance of cultural diversity by individuals on desegregated campuses. There were those from each subgroup who held the opinion that this acceptance had not occurred as a result of higher education, yet the majority of each subgroup held positive opinions that higher education had resulted in acceptance of cultural diversity by individuals on desegregated campuses (Table 55).

Demographical Information on Respondents

The final section of the survey instrument asked for educational level, demographic and geographical information. One hundred percent (100%) of the SHEEO's and Presidents of Historically Black Universities had obtained a doctorate. Of the Presidents of Historically White Universities, 92.7% had obtained a doctorate with the other 7.3% holding a professional degree. The Legislative Chairs were the most diverse subgroup educationally with 20% holding doctorates; 10.0% with professional degrees; 40.0% with a master's; 20.0% with a bachelor's; and 10.0% with a technical degree. The degrees for the total population were earned in the following fields of study:

Education	34.9%
Business	7.9%
Liberal Arts	23.8%
Engineering	6.3%
Science	17.5%
Law	4.8%
Other	4.8%

The undergraduate degrees of the respondents' were earned by 17.5% at Historically Black Universities and 82.5% at Historically White Universities. The survey was responded to by 92.1% men and 7.9% women. Of the survey respondents 79.4% were white and 20.6% were black. All SHEEO's were white. All Presidents of Historically Black Universities were black. Of the presidents of Historically White Universities 92.7% were white and 7.3% were black. Of the Legislative Chairs 70.0% were white and 30.0% were black.

Only 9.5% of the public policy-makers were younger than 45 years of age. Only 44.4% were between 46-55 years of age and 46.0% were 56 years of age or older. The Presidents of Historically Black Universities (71.4%) were 56 years of age or older. Sixty percent (60%) of the SHEEO's were 56 years of age or older. Legislative Chairs and Presidents of Historically White Universities were the youngest in age of the four subgroups.

Table 56 reflects the years of experience as public policy-makers in higher education for the SHEEO's and Presidents.

Table 56

Number of Years' Experience in Higher Education: SHEEO's and Presidents

	2-10 Years	11-20 Years	21-29 Years	30+ Years
SHEEO's	20.0		40.0	40.0
Presidents of Historically White Universities	4.9	22.0	36.6	36.6
Presidents of Historically Black Universities		28.6	14.3	57.1

For the purpose of this table only, SHEEO's, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Presidents of Historically Black Universities were reported.

Table 57 reflects the years of experience as a public policy-maker in a legislative body for legislative chairs.

Table 57

Number of Years' Experience In Legislature: Legislative Chairs

	2-10 Years	11-20 Years	21-29 Years	30+ Years
Legislative Chairs	20.0	60.0	20.0	

It should be noted a number of Presidents of Historically Black Universities marked legislative experience as did one SHEEO, but for the purpose of this study, only Legislative Chairs' experience in a political body was reported. Several Legislative Chairs' reported higher education experience. This academic experience was not reported in this study.

Table 58 reflects the geographical representation of the survey respondents' by subgroup.

Table 58

Geographical Location of Employment of Four Survey Subgroups

	Alabama	Arkansas	Louisiana	Mississippi	Tennessee
Legislative Chairs	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
SHEEO's	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0	20.0
Presidents of Historically White Universities	29.3	19.5	22.0	12.2	17.1
Presidents of Historically Black Universities	14.3	14.3	28.6	42.9	

This study was of enough interest to the survey respondents that 90.3% expressed an interest in the results and 90.3% expressed an interest in participating in a follow-up study within five years.

CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter is a brief summation of the purpose of this study, the design of the research, and a review of the findings. As a result of the findings of the study and the review of the literature, recommendations are made for areas of further study.

Summary

The purposes of this study were to survey the attitudes and perceptions of a selected group of public policy-makers within Alabama, Arkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee and to determine areas which could form a genuine set of fundamental policies for desegregation. A review of the literature identified discussion areas within the process of desegregation. These areas were barriers to desegregation, methodology of desegregation and the results of desegregation. Participants were asked to respond to a survey questionnaire on selected desegregation issues of importance. The questionnaire consisted of thirteen (13) statements in three broad groupings, as follows: (1) current status of desegregation, which included history, barriers, and environment; (2) accomplishing desegregation; and (3) results of desegregation. The questions were issue-oriented, time-oriented and demographic in nature.

A total of seventy-one (71) surveys was mailed and sixty-three (63) were returned for a response rate of 88.7%. The public policy-makers were SHEEO's, Legislative Chairs, Presidents of Historically White Universities and Presidents of Historically Black Universities. These formed the four subgroups for analysis purposes. The responses of the four subgroups were entered into a database for analysis. A mean response and percentage response for each statement were determined. The data were analyzed to determine the level of agreement or disagreement to the various statements presented in the survey and a rank order was created where applicable.

Findings

Analysis of the data showed significant differences among the subgroups on some statements and consensus on other statements.

Statement A

Statement A, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that the following areas are components of a state's or a university's desegregation policies:

1. **University Mission Statements**
2. **Closures/Mergers:**
   - **A. of Programs**
   - **B. of Universities**
3. **Admission Requirements**
4. **Alumni Views**
5. **Student Views**
6. **Program Offerings**

7. **State's Financial Resources**

8. **Reallocation of Existing Resources**

9. **Equity Funding for Past Disparity**

10. **Racial Representation on Governing Boards,"**

resulted in a consensus of the four subgroups on some areas.

The following areas were considered to be components of desegregation:

- 1. **University Mission Statements**
- 2A. **Closures/Mergers of Programs**
- 3. **Admission Requirements**
- 5. **Student Views**
- 6. **Program Offerings**
- 7. **State's Financial Resources**
- 8. **Reallocation of Existing Resources**
- 10. **Racial Representation on Governing Boards**

The areas in which one subgroup or more did not agree that it was a component of desegregation were as follows:

- 2B. **Closures/Mergers of Universities**
- 4. **Alumni Views**
- 9. **Equity Funding for Past Disparity**

The Presidents of Historically Black Universities disagreed with the other subgroups on component 2B. Legislative Chairs disagreed with the other subgroups on component 4. The Presidents of Historically White Universities disagreed with the other subgroups on component 9. All other components received 50.0% or more positive responses from all four subgroups.

Statement B

Statement B, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that these events have merit in accomplishing desegregation:

1. **Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses**
2. **Other Race (other race represents blacks at Historically White Universities; Whites at Historically Black Universities)**
   - **A. Scholarships**
   - **B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives (e.g. early tenure, paid moving expenses)**
3. **Across Universities**
   - **A. Equal Admissions**
   - **B. Equal Tuition,"**

resulted in consensus on all five events. These were events which received 50.1% or more positive merit responses by each of the four subgroups. Positive merit was the combined percents of extreme merit, high merit, merit, and some merit.

Statement C

Statement C, "Please assess the extent to which you feel the following are appropriate in a desegregated environment:

1. **Single-race Institutions**
2. **Racial Quotas**

3. Ethnic Studies,"

resulted in consensus in two (2) of the three (3) areas.

All four subgroups responded that single race institutions were inappropriate in a desegregated environment. Additionally, consensus was expressed by all four subgroups responding that Ethnic Studies were somewhat appropriate, appropriate or highly appropriate. The only area in which there was no consensus was racial quotas. The Presidents of Historically White Universities responded that racial quotas were inappropriate. The other three (3) subgroups responded to racial quotas favorably.

Statement D

Statement D, "Please assess the extent to which you feel these events have significantly improved desegregation efforts in higher education:

1. **Department actions of the U.S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)**
2. **Integration in the Military**
3. **Desegregation of Public Schools**
4. **Lawsuits**
    - **A. Adams versus Richardson**
    - **B. Brown versus Board of Education**
    - **C. Ayers versus Fordice,"**

resulted in consensus on all events. Each subgroup responded positive agreement that these events had improved desegregation efforts in higher education. This positive agreement was 50.1% or more after totalling strongly agree and agree.

Statement E

Statement E, "Please assess the extent to which you feel the following are barriers to student/faculty/staff desegregation:

1. **Being a minority placed within a majority**
2. **Feelings of comfort in being in the majority**
3. **Availability of a comparable social community,"**

resulted in consensus on two (2) of the three (3) barriers. All four subgroups expressed by 50.1% or more that items 1 and 2 were barriers. This resulted in the totalling of significant barrier, large barrier, and slight barrier. The one item upon which there was no consensus was item 3. The SHEEO's and Presidents of Historically Black Universities held the opinion that availability of a comparable social community was not a barrier. The other two (2) subgroups held that it was a barrier to student/faculty/staff desegregation.

Statement F

Statement F, "Please assess the influence each of the following groups has had on desegregation efforts:

1. **State Legislatures**
2. **Judicial Systems**
3. **U.S. Office of Civil Rights**
4. **Governing Boards**
5. **State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)**
6. **Faculty**
7. **Presidents/CEO's**

8. Alumni

9. Students

10. Interest and Special Groups

11. Individuals

12. Employers of Graduates,"

resulted in consensus on three (3) of the twelve (12) groups. The constituencies upon which the four subgroups reached a 50.1% response in the positive (strong influence and influence) consensus were as follows:

2. Judicial Systems
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights
4. Governing Boards

The other nine (9) groups received mixed responses, and there was no consensus from the subgroups either negative, positive, or neutral.

Statement G

Statement G, "Please assess the change in attitudes during the last 17 years toward desegregation in the following geographical locations:

1. Nationally

2. Regionally

3. State,"

resulted in a consensus from all four subgroups. The four subgroups responded in excess of 50.1% positive (extremely positive and positive).

Statement H

Statement H, "Please assess attitudes toward more extensive desegregation within various groups:

1. **Alumni**
2. **Students**
3. **Faculty**
4. **Presidents**
5. **SHEEO's**
6. **Political Leaders**
7. **Special Interest Groups,"**

resulted in consensus of four (4) of the seven (7) groups.

The four (4) areas of consensus were as follows:

2. Students
3. Faculty
4. SHEEO's
5. Presidents

These groups received 50.1% or more positive (positive and extremely positive) responses. The other areas had one or more subgroups to respond differently. The Alumni received negative (negative and extremely negative) from three (3) out of four (4) subgroups. Only the Presidents of Historically Black Universities responded 50.1% or more in the positive (positive and extremely positive). Political Leaders received no consensus. Special Interest Groups received a positive response from three (3) out of four (4) subgroups. Only

Presidents of Historically Black Institutions responded in the negative.

Statement I

Statement I, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that the efforts to desegregate higher education are in crisis," resulted in consensus. All four (4) subgroups agreed that the efforts to desegregate higher education are in crisis.

Statement J

Statement J, "Please assess the extent to which the following individuals spend their time on desegregation issues:

1. **Presidents**
2. **Legislators**
3. **State Governing Boards, SHEEO's, Staff,"**

resulted in consensus on one (1) of the three (3) individual groups. All four subgroups agreed that legislators spend little time on desegregation issues. The responses were mixed for the other two groups.

Statement K

Statement K, "Please assess the amount of time you spend on desegregation issues," resulted in little agreement between subgroups' perceptions of others' time spent on desegregation issues and the actual reported time by that subgroup except for Legislative Chairs. Legislative Chairs reported spending little time on desegregation issues and the other three subgroups agreed that Legislative Chairs spend little time on desegregation issues.

Statement L

Statement L, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that desegregation of higher education has significantly resulted in moving African-Americans into the mainstream of society," resulted in consensus among the four subgroups. Each group agreed by 50.1% or more that this had occurred.

Statement M

Statement M, "Please assess the extent to which you agree that desegregation of higher education has resulted in acceptance of cultural diversity by individuals on desegregated campuses," resulted in consensus among the four groups. The consensus was that 50.1% or more responses were strongly agree or agree.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the research and the review of the literature, the following recommendations are proposed:

1. Additional research should be conducted on those statements with a consensus and the most positive responses. This research would provide a strong basis for a public policy focus within the region.
2. A survey is needed to determine if there are successful models of desegregation of public higher education which incorporate components of this study indicated by respondents as being important to quality desegregation.
3. A follow-up study is recommended after the Ayers versus Fordice lawsuit is concluded to determine if there are any changes in attitudes and perceptions from this benchmark study.

4. Items of disagreement need further study to determine reasons and possible solutions.
5. A study on regional consensus-building utilizing the components which have the most agreement is recommended. This could form a basis for regional unity on an important regional and educational issue.

REFERENCES

Adams, J. Q. (1993). Through the looking glass and what the Supreme Court finds there: The political setting of United States vs. Fordice, Mississippi Law Journal, 62(2), 263-283.

Arnold, L. (1993). Special Assistant Attorney General, Office of the Attorney General, Mississippi. correspondence.

Astin, H. S. and P. H. Cross (1981). Black students in black and white institutions. In Gail E. Thomas (Ed.), Black Students in Higher Education, (pp. 30-45). Westport, Connecticut & London, England: Greenwood Press.

Blackwell, J. (1988). The access of black students to medical and law schools: trends and Bakke implications. In Gail E. Thomas (Ed.), Black Students in Higher Education, (p. 215). Westport, Connecticut & London, England: Greenwood Press.

Blake, E., Jr. (1991). Is higher education desegregation a remedy for segregation but not educational inequality? A study of the Ayers v. Mabus desegregation case. The Journal of Negro Education, 60(4), 538-565.

Board of Regents, State of Louisiana (1993). correspondence.
Board of Trustees of Mississippi State Institutions of Higher Learning (October, 1992). The Ayers decision, Volume I.

Braddock, J. H. II and J. M. McPartland (1988). Some cost and benefit considerations for black college students attending predominantly white versus predominantly black universities. In Michael T. Nettles (Ed.), Toward Black Undergraduate Student Equality in American Higher Education. (p. 97). New York, Westport & London: Greenwood Press.

Brown, C. G. (1988). The role and responsibility of the federal government: strategies for achieving qualitative equality at the national level. Toward Black Undergraduate Student Equality in American Higher Education, No. 25, p. 126.

Connell, M. A. (1993). The road to United States v. Fordice: what is the duty of public colleges and universities in former de jure states to desegregate? Mississippi Law Journal, 62, 306.

Cole, C. (1988). Issues surrounding coordinating/governance of higher education. Unpublished manuscript for the Tennessee Higher Education Commission.

Davis, R. N. (1993). The quest for equal education in Mississippi: the implications of United States v. Fordice, Mississippi Law Journal, 62(2), pp. 405-508.

Fleming, J. (1984). Blacks in college. San Francisco, California: Jossey-Bass.

Harvey, J. (September 30, 1993). Adjunct Professor, Jackson State University (1993). Interview.

Haynes, L. L. III (1978). A Critical Examination of the Adams Case: A Source Book. Washington, D.C.: Institute for Services to Education, p. II-3.

HEP Higher Education Directory (1993). Falls Church, Virginia. Higher Education Publications.

Hodgkinson, H. (1993). Southern crossroads: a demographic look at the southeast. Southeastern Regional Vision for Education Report . (pp. 31-62).

Hoffman, N. (1993, March/April). Shifting gears: How to get results with affirmative action. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, pp. 30-34.

Institute for the Study of Educational Policy. (1976). Equal Educational Opportunity for Blacks in U. S. Higher Education. Washington, DC: Howard University Press. Kenneth S. Tollett (Eds).

Jones, L. W. & F. A. Nowotny (Eds.). (1990). An Agenda for the New Decade. San Francisco & Oxford: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Kerr, C. (1990). Higher education cannot escape history: The 1990s. In Larry W. Jones and Franz A. Nowotny (Eds.), An Agenda for the New Decade (pp. 5-17). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Milano, J. M. and E. L. Carey (1987), Racial integration in the United States army. The Western Journal of Black Studies, Vol. 11 No. 1, pp. 47-56.

Mohr, P. B. Sr. (1993). Director of Special Programs, Alabama Commission on Higher Education. correspondence.

Navarrette, R. Jr. (1993, March/April). New victims? Weighing the charges of reverse discrimination. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, pp. 8-9, 52-53.

Olson, C. & Hagy, J. (1990). Achieving social justice: An examination of Oklahoma's response to Adams v. Richardson. The Journal of Negro Education, 59. 173-185.

Orfield, G. (1993, March/April). Refurbishing a rusted dream. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, pp. 12-15.

Preer, J. (1982). Lawyers v. educators: Changing perceptions of desegregation in public higher education. Journal of Higher Education, 53. 119-144.

Stimpson, C. R. (1993, March/April). Rethinking affirmative action. Change: The Magazine of Higher Learning, pp. 4-5.

Thomas, G. E. & McPartland, J. (1984). Have college desegregation policies threatened black student enrollment and black colleges?: An empirical analysis. The Journal of Negro Education, 53(4), 398-399.

Tribble, I. Jr. (1988). Desegregation of higher education: a private/public cooperative alternative. In John B. Williams, III (Ed.)., Desegregating America's Colleges and Universities, (p. 93). New York & London: Teachers College Press.

United States v. Fordice (1992). Harvard Law Review, 106, p. 230.

Wiggins, S. P. (1970). The desegregation era in higher education. California: McCutchan.

Williams, J. B. III (Ed.). (1988). The future of title vi regulation of higher education. Desegregating America's Colleges and Universities: Title VI Regulation of Higher Education, New York & London: Teachers College Press.

Williams-Bishop, R. C. (July 23, 1991). Ayers v. Mabus: Public policy implications for the desegregation of higher education in Mississippi, a thesis.

Wilson, R. (1988). The role of private interest groups in achieving equality for black students in higher education. Toward Black Undergraduate Student Equality in American Higher Education, pp. 179-180.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

LEGAL REVIEW LETTER FROM MR. STEVE KIRCHMAYR, Esq.

MISSISSIPPI

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Stephen J. Kirchmayr
Special Assistant to
The Commisssioner

MEMORANDUM

CONFIDENTIAL

TO: Ann Homer Cook

FROM: Steve Kirchmayr

DATE: May 21, 1993

RE: Pilot Survey

As per your request, I have reviewed the attached "Pilot Survey" you would like to use as an information gathering tool for your doctoral thesis. This date, I also spoke with Mr. Bill Goodman and asked him to review the "Pilot Survey".

Neither Mr. Goodman nor I feel that this survey will interfere or conflict with the Ayers litigation, and we have no objection to your using the "Pilot Survey".

3825 Ridgewood Road • Jackson, Mississippi 39225-2336 • (601) 982-6295

APPENDIX B

SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE

Survey

In assessing the following statements, please use the key to the right of each statemen:

A. Please assess the extent to which you agree that the following areas are components of a state's or a university's desegregation policies:

1. University Mission Statements 1 2 3 4
2. Closures/Mergers:
   A. of Programs 1 2 3 4
   B. of Universities 1 2 3 4
3. Admission Requirements 1 2 3 4
4. Alumni Views 1 2 3 4
5. Student Views 1 2 3 4
6. Program Offerings 1 2 3 4
7. State's Financial Resources 1 2 3 4
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources 1 2 3 4
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity 1 2 3 4
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards 1 2 3 4

Key A:

1. **Strongly Agree**
2. **Agree**
3. **Disagree**
4. **Strongly Disagree**

B. Please assess the extent to which you agree that these events have merit in accomplishing desegregation:

1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses 1 2 3 4 5
2. Other Race
   (Other race represents Black at HWI, White at HBI)
   A. Scholarships 1 2 3 4 5
   B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives
   (e.g. early tenure, paid moving expenses) 1 2 3 4 5
3. Across Universities
   A. Equal Admissions 1 2 3 4 5
   B. Equal Tuition 1 2 3 4 5

Key B:

1. **Extreme Merit**
2. **High Merit**
3. **Merit**
4. **Some Merit**
5. **No Merit**

C. Please assess the extent to which you feel the following are appropriate in a desegregated environment:

1. Single Race Institutions 1 2 3 4
2. Racial Quotas 1 2 3 4
3. Ethnic Studies 1 2 3 4

Key C:

1. **Highly Appropriate**
2. **Appropriate**
3. **Somewhat Appropriate**
4. **Inappropriate**

D. Please assess the extent to which you feel these events have significantly improved desegregation efforts in higher education:

1. Department Actions of the U. S. Government
   (e.g. HEW, Justice) 1 2 3 4
2. Integration in the Military 1 2 3 4
3. Desegregation of Public Schools 1 2 3 4
4. Lawsuits
   A. Adams versus Richardson 1 2 3 4
   B. Brown versus Board of Education 1 2 3 4
   C. Ayers versus Fordice 1 2 3 4

Key D:

1. **Strongly Agree**
2. **Agree**
3. **Disagree**
4. **Strongly Disagree**

E. Please assess the extent to which you feel the following are barriers to student/faculty/staff desegregation:

1. Being a minority placed within a majority 1 2 3 4
2. Feelings of comfort in being in the majority 1 2 3 4
3. Availability of a comparable social community 1 2 3 4

Key E:

1. **Significant Barrier**
2. **Large Barrier**
3. **Slight Barrier**
4. **Not a Barrier**

F. Please assess the influence each of the following groups has had on desegregation efforts:

1. State Legislatures 1 2 3 4 5
2. Judicial Systems 1 2 3 4 5
3. U. S. Office of Civil Rights 1 2 3 4 5
4. Governing Boards 1 2 3 4 5
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO) 1 2 3 4 5
6. Faculty 1 2 3 4 5
7. Presidents/CEOs 1 2 3 4 5
8. Alumni 1 2 3 4 5
9. Students 1 2 3 4 5
10. Interest & Special Groups 1 2 3 4 5
11. Individuals 1 2 3 4 5
12. Employers of Graduates 1 2 3 4 5

Key F:

1. **Strong Positive Influence**
2. **Positive Influence**
3. **No Influence**
4. **Negative Influence**
5. **Strong Negative Influence**

G. Please assess the change in attitudes during the last 17 years toward desegregation in the following geographical locations:

1. Nationally 1 2 3 4
2. Regionally 1 2 3 4
3. State 1 2 3 4

Key G:

1. **Extremely Positive**
2. **Positive**
3. **Negative**
4. **Extremely Negative**

Continued

Survey, Continued

H. Please assess attitudes toward more extensive desegregation within various groups:

1	Alumni	1	2	3	4
2	Students	1	2	3	4
3	Faculty	1	2	3	4
4	Presidents	1	2	3	4
5	State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	1	2	3	4
6	Political Leaders	1	2	3	4
7	Special Interest Groups	1	2	3	4

Key H:

1. **Extremely Positive**
2. **Positive**
3. **Negative**
4. **Extremely Negative**

I. Please assess the extent to which you agree that the efforts to desegregate higher education are in crisis.

1 2 3 4

Key I:

1. **Strongly Agree**
2. **Agree**
3. **Disagree**
4. **Strongly Disagree**

J. Please assess the extent to which the following individuals spend their time on desegregation issues:

1	Presidents	1	2	3	4
2	Legislators	1	2	3	4
3	State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff	1	2	3	4

Key J:

1. **Significant Time**
2. **Much Time**
3. **Little Time**
4. **No Time**

K. Please assess the amount of time you spend on desegregation issues:

1 2 3 4

Key K:

1. **Significant Time**
2. **Much Time**
3. **Little Time**
4. **No Time**

L. Please assess the extent to which you agree that desegregation of higher education has significantly resulted in moving African Americans into the mainstream of society.

1 2 3 4

Key L:

1. **Strongly Agree**
2. **Agree**
3. **Disagree**
4. **Strongly Disagree**

M. Please assess the extent to which you agree that desegregation of higher education has resulted in acceptance of cultural diversity by individuals on desegregated campuses.

1 2 3 4

Key M:

1. **Strongly Agree**
2. **Agree**
3. **Disagree**
4. **Strongly Disagree**

Please provide the following information for this study:

---

1. A. The highest earned degree you now hold:

Bachelor's ____ Master's ____
Professional ____ Doctorate ____

B. Highest degree earned is in the field of:

Education ____ Business ____
Liberal Arts ____ Engineering ____
Science ____ Law ____
Other ____________

2. Undergraduate degree earned at:

Historically black institution ____________
Historically white institution ____________

3. Gender: Male ____ Female ____

4. Race: White ____ Black ____ Other ____

5. Age: Under 45 ____ 46-55 ____
56+ ____

6. A. The total number of years' experience in higher education, if appropriate:

2-10 ____ 11-20 ____
21-29 ____ 30+ ____

B. The total number of years' experience in the legislature, if appropriate:

2-10 ____ 11-20 ____
21-29 ____ 30+ ____

7. Your employment geographical location:

AL ____ LA ____ TN ____
AR ____ MS ____

8. Would you consider responding to a follow-up questionnaire in five years or after the implementation of the Ayers Decision?

Yes ____________ No ____________

9. Would you like to see the results of this study?

Yes ____________ No ____________

APPENDIX C

LETTER OF TRANSMITTAL TO PARTICIPANTS IN THE STUDY

MISSISSIPPI

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Office of Associate
Commissioner

SURVEY LETTER

SURVEY OF SELECTED PUBLIC POLICY-MAKERS IN THE DEEP SOUTH STATES OF ARKANSAS, ALABAMA, LOUISIANA, MISSISSIPPI AND TENNESSEE TO IDENTIFY THEIR ATTITUDES AND PERCEPTIONS OF THE DESEGREGATION PROCESS OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Recently, the U. S. Supreme Court ruled in Ayers versus Fordice that states which once operated officially segregated university systems must do more than adopt race-neutral admission policies which allow college attendance by choice. Additionally, the Court stated that in dismantling that system the state must take necessary steps to insure that choice is truly free.

These statements appear to create significant discussion among policy-makers on the subject of higher education desegregation. This survey is concerned with the attitudes and perceptions of selected policy-makers on the issues of desegregation. The writer will not seek to establish causes between or among groups but only identify differences shown by responses. This survey is for a doctoral dissertation in the School of Education. The participation in this study is entirely voluntary and confidential. If you are willing to participate, please complete this survey and return it by July 1, 1993 to:

Ann Homer Cook
Associate Commissioner
Mississippi Institutions of Higher Learning
3825 Ridgewood Road
Jackson, MS 39211

Phone: (601) 982-6690

3825 Ridgewood Road • Jackson, Mississippi 39211-6453 • (601) 982-6493

APPENDIX D

LETTER TO PILOT SURVEY PARTICIPANTS

MISSISSIPPI

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Office of Associate
Commissioner

May 26, 1993

Dr. Jim Strobel, President
Erskine College
Due West, SC 29639-0338

Dear Dr. Strobel:

I am asking several key individuals to assist in a pilot survey by responding to a tentative questionnaire form. I plan to use this form for gathering data for a doctoral dissertation on desegregation. Because of your leadership experience and position, your opinion is valuable for me to design a clear, concise and accurate survey instrument. As a given professional in your field, would you please review this instrument for form, content and style? If your schedule will allow you to participate, please let me know at your earliest convenience. My telephone number is (601) 982-6690. My FAX number is (601) 987-4172. Your participation should require only minimal time.

I'm including a copy of my survey cover letter for your review and comment also.

Sincerely,

aCook

Ann Homer Cook
Associate Commissioner

Enclosures

3825 Ridgewood Road • Jackson, Mississippi 39211-6453 • (601) 982-6493

APPENDIX E

LETTERS OF ENDORSEMENT FROM DRS. W. RAY CLEERE, WALTER WASHINGTON, MARK MUSICK

MISSISSIPPI

INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

Office of Commissioner

June 14, 1993

Dr. Henry J. Hector
Executive Director
Commission on Higher Education
One Court Square, #221
Montgomery, Alabama 36197

Dear Hank:

Attached you will find a survey that Ms. Ann Homer Cook, our Associate Commissioner, is distributing in selected states. We believe the information acquired as part of her doctoral dissertation will be quite helpful as southern states address the crucial aftermath of the Ayers vs. Fordice case. Your assistance in completing the attached questionnaire will be greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Ray Cleere

WRC:dgh

Attachment

cc: Ms. Ann Homer Cook

3825 Ridgewood Road • P. O. Box 2336 • Jackson, Mississippi 39225-2336 • (601) 982-6614

ALCORN STATE UNIVERSITY
LORMAN, MISSISSIPPI 39096-9402

OFFICE OF THE PRESIDENT

June 16, 1993

Dr. David B. Henson, President
Alabama A&M University
Post Office Box 285
Normal, AL 35762

Dear Dr. Henson:

Mrs. Ann Homer Cook, Associate Commissioner of Higher Education and Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning for the state of Mississippi, is doing a doctoral dissertation at the University of Mississippi. Mrs. Cook is doing a survey of selected policy-makers in the deep south states of Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi and Tennessee to identify their attitudes and perceptions of the desegregation process of higher education.

I am urging you to support Mrs. Cook in this research by taking a few minutes from your busy schedule to respond to the enclosed questionnaire.

Should you have questions, do not hesitate to call Mrs. Cook or me.

Very truly yours,

Walter Washington
President

WW:mti

Southern Regional Education Board 592 Tenth Street, N.W. • Atlanta, Georgia 3031

June 23, 1993

Dr. Thomas E. Harrison
Troy State University at Dothan
227 North Foster Street
Dothan, AL 36301-6947

Dear Dr. Harrison :

Ann Homer Cook, Associate Commissioner of Higher Education and Executive Secretary of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning for the State of Mississippi, is completing a doctoral dissertation. Ms. Cook is surveying selected policy-makers in several states to identify their attitudes and perceptions of the desegregation process in higher education. I believe her work will contribute to the understanding of this important aspect of higher education. Her professional career has been distinguished by outstanding work at high levels of government and higher education.

I hope you will support Ms. Cook in this research by taking a few minutes from your busy schedule to respond to the enclosed questionnaire.

Sincerely,

Mark D. Musick

Mark D. Musick
President

MDM:rg
Enclosure

APPENDIX F

FACULTY DATA FOR DEEP SOUTH STATES

SOURCES FOR FACULTY DATA

Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Alabama
Contact: Ms. Minnie Lamberth
Phone: 205-281-1921

Arkansas Department of Higher Education
Little Rock, Arkansas
Contact: Ms. Karen Frost
Ms. Melissa Goff
Phone: 501-324-9300

Louisiana Board of Regents
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Contact: Mr. John Kay
Phone: 504-342-4253

Tennessee Board of Regents
Nashville, Tennessee
Contact: Mr. George Malo
Ms. Betty Dandridge
Phone: 615-366-4400

FULL-TIME FACULTY EMPLOYED BY HISTORICALLY WHITE, FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN THE STATES OF MISSISSIPPI, ALABAMA, ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TENNESSEE By Race, 1992

UNIVERSITY	PERCENT OF TOTAL FACULTY BY RACE			
	Percent White	**Percent Black**	**Percent Other**	**Total Faculty**
Mississippi				
Delta State University	92.2	6.0	1.8	217
Mississippi State University	91.7	3.4	4.9	768
Mississippi University for Women	94.7	3.0	2.3	132
University of Mississippi*	92.0	4.2	3.7	565
University of Southern Mississippi	94.7	3.0	2.3	639
Alabama				
Auburn University	92.2	2.1	5.7	1143
Auburn University - Montgomery	91.2	4.2	4.7	193
Jacksonville State University	94.5	3.3	2.2	274
Livingston University	88.9	4.4	6.7	90
Troy State University	93.1	3.2	3.7	188
Troy State University - Dothan	93.5	2.2	4.4	46
Troy State University - Montgomery	93.1	3.5	3.5	29
University of Alabama	93.2	2.2	4.6	891
University of Alabama - Birmingham	89.8	3.4	6.9	1613
University of Alabama - Huntsville	86.6	2.8	10.7	290
University of Alabama - Montevallo	93.7	.7	5.5	127
University of North Alabama	95.3	3.7	1.1	190
University of South Alabama	90.5	3.4	6.2	681
Arkansas				
Arkansas State University	92.0	4.6	3.4	413
Arkansas Tech University	95.0	1.7	3.4	179
Henderson State University	90.9	4.3	4.9	164
Southern Arkansas University	91.1	5.4	3.6	112

University of Arkansas, Fayetteville	92.4	2.3	5.3	826
University of Arkansas, Little Rock	90.9	4.3	4.9	492
University of Arkansas, Monticello	91.7	3.7	4.6	108
University of Central Arkansas	94.5	3.8	1.7	345
Louisiana				
Louisiana Tech University	92.6	2.2	5.2	404
McNeese State University	98.3	1.3	0.3	300
Nicholls State University	89.6	5.8	4.6	259
Northeast Louisiana University	93.3	3.0	3.7	462
Northwestern State University	91.5	4.2	4.2	259
Southeastern Louisiana University	91.2	1.1	7.7	375
University of Southwestern Louisiana	86.6	4.3	9.1	582
Louisiana State University - Baton Rouge	88.4	3.1	8.5	1331
Louisiana State University - Shreveport	92.9	3.2	3.9	155
University of New Orleans	86.5	4.9	8.6	513
Tennessee				
Austin Peay State University	90.8	5.4	3.8	239
East Tennessee State University*	94.7	2.5	2.8	471
Memphis State University	86.5	6.2	7.4	760
Middle Tennessee State University	88.6	7.1	4.4	638
Tennessee Technological University	87.8	3.9	8.3	361
University of Tennessee - Chattanooga	90.3	5.2	4.5	289
University of Tennessee - Knoxville	89.2	4.0	6.8	1198
University of Tennessee - Martin	91.2	4.0	4.8	250

*Does not include faculty for medical center.

Note: *Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding*

SOURCE: Chart compiled from data provided by the following statewide agencies of higher education:

Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Alabama
Arkansas Department of Higher Education, Little Rock, Arkansas
Louisiana Board of Regents, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Mississippi Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning
Tennessee Board of Regents, Nashville, Tennessee

FULL-TIME FACULTY EMPLOYED BY HISTORICALLY BLACK, FOUR-YEAR PUBLIC UNIVERSITIES IN THE STATES OF MISSISSIPPI, ALABAMA, ARKANSAS, LOUISIANA, AND TENNESSEE
By Race, 1992

UNIVERSITY	PERCENT OF TOTAL FACULTY BY RACE			
	Percent Black	**Percent White**	**Percent Other**	**Total Faculty**
Mississippi				
Alcorn State University	61.2	17.7	21.1	147
Jackson State University	66.8	21.4	11.8	346
Mississippi Valley State University	83.6	11.2	5.2	116
Alabama				
Alabama Agric. & Mech. University	57.3	22.4	20.3	295
Alabama State University	61.5	27.5	11.0	200
Arkansas				
University of Arkansas, Pine Bluff	69.7	17.0	13.3	165
Louisiana				
Grambling State University	68.1	18.9	13.0	285
Southern University - Baton Rouge	76.7	12.1	11.1	494
Southern University - New Orleans	60.1	29.7	10.1	148
Tennessee				
Tennessee State University	48.3	43.4	8.2	329

Note: *Percentages may not equal 100% due to rounding.*

SOURCE: Chart compiled from data provided by the following statewide agencies of higher education:

Alabama Commission on Higher Education, Montgomery, Alabama
Arkansas Department of Higher Education, Little Rock, Arkansas
Louisiana Board of Regents, Baton Rouge, Louisiana
Mississippi Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning, Jackson, Mississippi
Tennessee Board of Regents, Nashville, Tennessee

APPENDIX G

KEY DATES IN ARKANSAS, ALABAMA, MISSISSIPPI, LOUISIANA, TENNESSEE

ARKANSAS

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY FOR CIVIL RIGHTS

February 9, 1988

Honorable William Clinton
Office of the Governor
State Capitol Building, Room 520
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

Dear Governor Clinton:

The U.S. Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (OCR) has completed its review of efforts by the state of Arkansas under the Arkansas College and University Plan for Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Statewide Plan, 1977 and the Revised Addendum, September, 1983 (Plan).[1] The Plan was initially accepted by OCR in 1978, substantially revised in 1983, and expired in December 1985. The Plan included activities to be carried out by the state of Arkansas and its 19 public colleges and universities to eliminate illegal vestiges of the formerly de jure segregated system of higher education.

Enclosed is the "Final Report on Efforts Pursuant to the Arkansas College and University Plan for Compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964: Statewide Plan (1977) and Revised Addendum (September, 1983)." This report takes into account comments received from the state and the public in response to the draft report issued on March 27, 1987.

The Plan included a wide range of affirmative measures designed to eliminate illegal vestiges of prior de jure segregation in three areas of higher education, as described in the Revised Criteria Specifying the Ingredients of Acceptable Plans to Desegregate State Systems of Public Higher Education promulgated by OCR in 1978 (Revised Criteria). Those areas are:

(1) disestablishment of the dual system and enhancement of the traditionally black institution;

(2) desegregation of student enrollment; and

(3) desegregation of faculty, administrative staff, non-academic personnel and governing boards.

OCR has reviewed activities undertaken by the state in the above areas during the seven years of the Plan to determine whether

---

[1] As used herein, the terms "approved desegregation plan," "plan" and "Plan" refer to the original plan accepted by OCR and all revisions and amendments accepted by OCR.

400 MARYLAND AVE. S.W. WASHINGTON D.C. 20202

Arkansas is now in compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

A. STANDARD OF REVIEW

Where a state has operated a dual system of higher education, regulations promulgated pursuant to Title VI require that it take "affirmative action to overcome the effects of prior discrimination" (34 C.F.R. 100.3(b)(6)(i)). Pursuant to the Plan, the state of Arkansas and OCR agreed that certain affirmative measures would be taken to overcome the effects of Arkansas' former dual system of higher education. In determining whether Arkansas is now in compliance with Title VI, OCR assessed whether the state and the institutions covered by the Plan substantially implemented the affirmative measures contained therein.

In cases where a measure specified in an approved desegregation plan has not been implemented, OCR may determine that a state is in substantial compliance with such plan if all of the facts show that significant actions were taken to achieve the objective(s) intended to be carried out by such measure. In making this determination, OCR may consider some or all of the following factors: (i) whether OCR previously approved a change in the approved plan permitting such measure to be eliminated and/or replaced with another comparable measure; (ii) whether the state or an institution, as the case may be, at its own initiative undertook another comparable activity; or (iii) whether the failure to implement a measure in a given area was not significant in light of all other measures undertaken in that area.

Substantial compliance with an approved desegregation plan does not require that a state enroll or graduate a particular percentage of black students either in the system as a whole or in any particular institution within the system. Although the Revised Criteria referred to numerical goals and timetables, which, in turn, were to be incorporated into an approved desegregation plan, these goals and timetables were established as indices to measure progress. They were expressly not intended as measures of compliance with Title VI.[2] Thus, OCR will not presume illegal discrimination solely because a state fails to achieve one or more numerical goals. Conversely, the achievement of numerical goals would not necessarily relieve a state of its legal obligation under Title VI to comply substantially with the terms of an approved desegregation plan.

---

[2] The Revised Criteria provided that the goals and timetables were "not quotas." The Revised Criteria went on explicitly to state that "failure to achieve a goal is not sufficient evidence, standing alone, to establish a violation of Title VI."

B. PLAN IMPLEMENTATION

The following summarizes Arkansas' implementation of each of the three major components of its Plan:

1. Disestablishment of the Structure of the Dual System and Enhancement of the Traditionally Black Institution.

The University of Arkansas at Pine Bluff (UAPB) traditionally serves a predominantly black student population. Arkansas agreed to improve the funding, physical facilities, and academic programs at UAPB so that they would be comparable to those of four traditionally white institutions (TWIs) with similar missions. From 1978 to 1984, the average annual operating budget funding per student was higher at UAPB than at any of the other four similar institutions. The percentage of students receiving state-funded scholarships from UAPB increased from 4.4 percent in 1980 to 22 percent in 1985; two similar TWIs had higher percentages of students with such scholarships and two had lower percentages (See the enclosed Final Report, pp. 3-5; subsequent parenthetical page citations refer to the enclosed Final Report). Arkansas brought 81 percent of the physical plant at the TBI to average or better condition by 1984; again, two of the similar institutions had higher percentages (84 and 83 percent) and two had lower percentages (77 and 64 percent). From 1978 to 1984, capital expenditures were higher at UAPB than at any of the other four similar institutions. UAPB received $11.7 million; the next highest amount received by a comparable TWI was $7.5 million (pp. 5-6). Arkansas likewise complied with the Plan provisions for improving academic programs at UAPB. An extensive study of the role, scope, and mission of each institution was completed. Nine new baccalaureate programs were established at UAPB, and funds were allocated for improvements in other academic programs (p. 7). UAPB also had a higher percentage of faculty members with doctorates than the other four similar institutions and ranked third in student/faculty ratio (p. 5). UAPB implemented measures required by the Plan to desegregate its student enrollment, principally by making significant efforts to recruit white students (pp. 10-11).

2. Desegregation of Student Enrollment.

Arkansas substantially implemented all student desegregation activities required by the Plan. They included a statewide recruitment program; expanded state scholarship and loan programs; implementation of core transfer curricula, designed to facilitate transfers between state institutions; circulation of list of potential black candidates for admission; and a graduate recruitment day (pp. 9-12).

Institutional efforts included scholarship and financial aid programs, extensive recruitment efforts in high schools, year institutions, remedial and counseling programs, and faculty advisers for new students (pp. 8-9, 16-41). OCR found that all institutions (including the UAPB) substantially implemented undergraduate, graduate and professional school recruitment and retention measures called for in the Plan. In addition substantially to complying with the Plan, the state and its institutions took other voluntary steps to desegregate Arkansas' public institutions of higher education (pp. 8, 16-41).

3. Desegregation of Faculty, Administrative Staff, Non-Academic Personnel and Governing Boards.

Arkansas implemented statewide commitments concerning the desegregation of employment in its higher education system (p. 45). The state established a Faculty/Administrator Development Fellows Program to recruit black faculty. The state also provided recruitment assistance to institutions seeking minority candidates for non-academic positions (p. 45).

Arkansas' colleges and universities substantially implemented all of the measures contained in the Plan to desegregate academic and non-academic positions. Several institutions took additional steps not required by the Plan to desegregate employment (pp. 45, 49-57). The most common activities were: provision of special fellowships for minority doctoral candidates; establishment of institutional affirmative action goals; implementation of a minority vita bank; targeted advertising of employment vacancies; and use of churches, members of the community and minority staff members in recruiting efforts. Minority staff also served on search committees. Adherence to nondiscriminatory employment procedures was monitored by each institution (p. 45). Arkansas also complied with the Plan requirements regarding black representation on boards of governance (pp. 48-49).

C. CONCLUSION

OCR has examined all activities and measures undertaken to desegregate the Arkansas public institutions of higher education pursuant to the Plan. OCR has determined that the state has substantially complied with the terms of the Plan. Accordingly, the Arkansas system of public higher education is now in compliance with Title VI, and no further desegregation measures will be required by OCR.

The state and its public institutions of higher education must continue to comply with Title VI and the regulations promulgated thereunder. Discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin is prohibited in any program or activity receiving federal financial assistance. In addition to periodic compliance reviews and other monitoring activities in the state, OCR will investigate and take appropriate enforcement action with respect to any complaint of discrimination that may be lodged against the Arkansas system of higher education or its individual institutions.

The state and its public institutions of higher education are encouraged to implement any additional voluntary measures which, in their view, would enhance the opportunities for equal participation in Arkansas' system of public higher education.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your assistance and the cooperation extended to OCR by state and higher education system officials during OCR's evaluation of the state's performance under the higher education desegregation Plan.

Sincerely,

LeGree S Daniels

LeGree S. Daniels
Assistant Secretary
for Civil Rights

Enclosures

cc: Dr. Gary Chamberlain, Director, Arkansas Department of Higher Education

---

Arkansas Department of Higher Education
114 East Capitol, Little Rock, AR 72201
(501) 324-9300
(501) 324-9799 (FAX)

EDWARD CROWE
ASSOCIATE DIRECTOR FOR
PLANNING AND RESEARCH

ALABAMA

A CHRONOLOGY OF THE KNIGHT V. ALABAMA CASE

1978 This case originated from a Title VI compliance investigation of Alabama's public higher education by the Office of Civil Rights, U. S. Department of Health,Education and Welfare (now the Department of Education).

1981 Governor Fob James and presidents of the public institutions received letters from the Department of Education stipulating that vestiges of the former *de jure* system allegedly remained in Alabama's public institutions of higher education in violation of Title VI. The stat was directed to submit a plan to assure future compliance with Title VI. Nineteen other states were required to prepare similar plans.

After months of unsuccessful negotiations been the Governor's representative and representatives of OCR, the Assistant Secretary for OCR sent a "ten-day letter" to the Governor stating if within ten days Alabama did not submit a plan to eliminate the alleged vestiges of the dual system of higher education, the matter would be referred to the Justice Department for litigation. No plan was submitted.

The knight plaintiffs filed suit, alleging that the desegregation of ASU was impeded by duplicative educational programming at ASU and TSUM, in violation of Title VI and the Fourteenth Amendment. However, the District Court granted a motion to the Governor and ACHE to stay all further action in *Knight v. James* pending resolution of Title VI administrative proceedings between the state of Alabama and the U. S. Department of Education. There was no resolution of the administrative proceedings.

1982 The stay was dissolved when the District Court was informed that the Department of Education had referred the Title VI enforcement proceedings to the Department of Justice.

The Middle District Court certified a plaintiff class consisting of graduates of ASU and African American citizens of Alabama who were eligible for employment by or who attended or may attend public institutions of higher education in the Montgomery area.

1983 The Justice Department filed its own lawsuit (U.S. V. Alabama), alleging that the defendants were maintaining vestiges of *de jure* segregation throughout its system of higher education. The District Court granted the motion of Knight, et al., to intervene in U.S. v. Alabama, on the ground that its outcome would be determinative of the issues in Knight v. James.

1984 The Court certified the Knight intervenors to represent essentially the same Montgomery-related class the Middle District had certified. The Middle District Court stayed all further proceedings in Knight v. James (which later became Knight v. Wallace) "until a final judgement or order is reached in U.S. v. Alabama."

1985 Judge U. W. Clemon, the first of seven judges assigned the case, presided during the first trial which began on July 1, 1985, and concluded on August 2, 1985. On December 9, 1985, he ruled that the state had failed to dismantle the vestiges of the prior de jure dual system. He then ordered the "State of Alabama, (the Governor, ACHE and APSCA)" to submit a plan to eliminate all vestiges of the dual system of higher education. However, he approved consent decrees between the United States and: Jacksonville State University; Livingston University; the University of South Alabama; and, the University of Montevallo. The consent decrees requires university commitment for Black representation relative to:

a. Governance
b. student access, admissions and retention
c. equal employment opportunity.

The United States considered the consent decrees to dispose of all claims which it made against these institutions.

1986 AU and the UA system filed a motion with the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals to stay the Clemon ruling. The stay was granted.

1987 The Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals reversed and remanded Clemon's ruling. It held that: the complaint of the United States should be dismissed without prejudice; the Knight Plaintiffs' Title VI claim should also be dismissed without prejudice; Judge Clemon be remove from the case; and a new trail be conducted if the Justice Department and the Knight Plaintiffs refile their claims. The Court of Appeals affirmed the Knight Plaintiffs' right to challenge vestiges of segregation under the Fourteenth Amendment. On remand, Knight, et al, were designated lead plaintiffs. The Knight Plaintiffs and the United States filed amended complaints.

1988 The Justice Department submitted to Governor Hunt a proposed consent decree and recommended that he and his staff review it and plan for a meeting to discuss the settlement. However, the suit continued due to lack of a settlement.

1989 After six other judges were recused on their own motion or by order of the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, the Court assigned Judge Harold Murphy of Rome, Georgia to the case. He reaffirmed the consent decrees for Jacksonville State

University, Livingston University, The University of Montevallo, and the University of South Alabama.

1990 Judge Murphy disposed of all pending motions to dismiss the statewide Title VI claims of the United States and the Knight Plaintiffs. He also approved two consent decrees. One was between the United States and the State Board of Education, Athens State College and Calhoun State Community College. The other consent decree was between the United States and Troy State University-Montgomery.

The trial began on October 29, 1990 and was concluded on April 16, 1991.

1991 On December 30, 1991, Judge Harold Murphy ruled that there were vestiges of discrimination in higher education and ordered the following:

1. Faculty Employment

The Court expects to see material improvement in the employment of Black faculty at the following institutions in three years:

a. Auburn
b. Montevallo
c. Livingston
d. Troy State University
e. Calhoun State Community College

2. Administrative Employment

The Court expects to see material improvement in the employment of Black Administrators at:

a. Auburn University
b. Calhoun State Community College
c. Jacksonville State University
d. Troy State University
e. The University of Alabama
f. The University of Alabama in Huntsville
g. The University of North Alabama

3. State Funding for Higher Education

The Alabama Commission on Higher Education shall modify its funding formula in the following fashion:

a. No more than the rate charged by ASU and AAMU, respectively, shall be applied to the average of the un-weighted on-campus semester credit hours (except military science) to obtain the amount of tuition and fee revenue to be deducted pursuant to the funding formula at Alabama State University and Alabama Agricultural and Mechanical University.

b. The weighting factors in the academic subdivision groupings shall have an undergraduate weight of two (2) in the complexity indices utilized in its proposed funding budget for remedial courses on the undergraduate level. A remedial course is one defined as such by the institution.

3. Facilities

The Governor of Alabama and the Alabama Commission on Higher Education, and the Alabama Public School and College Authority shall, consistent with the Court's findings of fact, eliminate all vestiges of discrimination remaining in the facilities at Alabama State University and Alabama A&M University.

a. Alabama A&M should receive $10,628,306.
b. Alabama State should receive at least $9,873,078.

4. Admissions Policies

The Court directs Auburn University to review and modify its current undergraduate admissions policy which will be in place by 1993-94. The policy is to be one which, in good faith, Auburn believes will not have, and in fact does not have a disproportionate impact on Black applicants.

5. Program Duplication

a. The Court is to receive recommendations from the Consent Decree Committee regarding the elimination of unnecessary program duplication in the area of business between Alabama A&M and Calhoun State Community College's satellite campus in Huntsville.

b. A newly established Committee on Cooperation is to focus on the duplication existing between Alabama State University and Auburn University at Montgomery in the areas of business and education. The Committee is to recommend to the Court the establishment of cooperative programs in these two areas with a view toward substantially reducing program duplication in the schools of business and education.

c. Alabama A&M University shall have preference for any new teacher education programs established in the Huntsville area.

d. The Alabama Commission on Higher Education shall given Alabama State University and Alabama A&M University preference in the establishment of new high demand programs in the Montgomery and Huntsville areas.

e. Before final approval of any new academic program in either the Huntsville or Montgomery area, ACHE shall notify the Court and furnish it with sufficient information so that the Court can satisfy itself that the program does not unnecessarily duplicate programs already in place at ASU or AAMU, or impede the segregation of ASU and AAMU.

6. Alabama Code Section 16-50-20(a)

For the reasons set forth in the Court's conclusion of law the following language from the Alabama Code is stricken as unconstitutional: "At least one-half of the (ASU) board shall be of the prevailing minority population of the state."

7. Recruitment of White students at Alabama State University

ASU must develop and implement a plan to recruit white students to its campus. The Court expects to see material improvement in ASU's white student enrollment within three years.

8. Previously Executed Consent Decrees

These consent decrees are extended to include the same period of time as the Decree entered this day by the Court. (See #11).

9. Monitoring Committee and Yearly Reporting

The Court established a statewide Monitoring Committee to make annual reports to the court concerning compliance with the requirements of the Remedial Decree. The Committee also shall make reports concerning the following matters for all defendant universities and colleges involved in the litigation, including those previously entering into consent decrees with the United States:

a. Racial composition of the student body.
b. Racial composition of the faculty and administration.
c. Minority faculty and administrator recruitment.
d. Annual state appropriations.
e. Changes in admissions policies.
f. Changes in tenure requirements.
g. Changes in the ACHE formula.
h. Minority student recruitment and retention at the undergraduate, graduate and professional level.

i. New appointments to boards of trustees and the Alabama State Board of Education.
j. Establishment of cooperative programs between institutions.
k. New facilities construction

The Monitoring Committee is comprised of the already existing Council of Presidents. For purposes of making the annual report, this group is augmented by the Governor's representative, ACHE's Executive Director, and the Chancellor of the Department of Postsecondary Education in his capacity as director of Athens State College and Calhoun State Community College.

10. Time Limitation for Objections to Reports

a. Defendants that have been called upon to provide the Court with initial written reports must serve copies of the same to all parties. Any objections to the reports shall be filed within 30 days following receipt.

b. All annual reports to the Court under terms of the Decree shall be served on all parties of record. Objections to the annual reports shall be filed within 30 days following receipt.

11. Jurisdiction and Term of the Remedial Consent Decree

a. The Decree became effective December 30, 1991 and shall remain effective until July 31, 2002.

b. The Court specifically reserves the authority to direct the transfer of funds or payment thereof to and between any party or parties to this case in order to effectuate the Decree, so long as such action by the Court comports with the Constitution of the United States.

c. On July 31, 2002, the Decree shall terminate automatically and without further formality unless a to the litigation, by motion filed not less than 60 days preceding the expiration date of the Decree, requests the Court to extend the term of the Decree.

d. The Court may extend the term of the Decree by entering an appropriate order if it deems that additional time is required to assure compliance and fully accomplish the Decree's objectives. The Court may also, at any time, modify or amend the terms and conditions of the Decree as needed to guarantee the elimination of any remaining vestiges of discrimination within Alabama's system and units of public higher education.

12. Attorneys' Fees

a. The Knight and Sims Plaintiffs are prevailing parties for purposes of an award of their attorney's fees and expenses with respect to all issues and stages of the litigation, including the parallel action in Knight v. James.

b. The Court ordered the parties to attempt to reach an agreement as to the amount of attorneys' fees and expenses. Since they did not, he has permitted the Plaintiffs' attorneys to file a motion for determination of the fees and expenses.

1992 Following are the major actions regarding the Remedial Decree:

1. Appeals

a. The Knight Plaintiffs and Plaintiffs-intervenors appealed to the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, indicating that the Court refused to grant the following injunctive relief the Plaintiffs requested:

1). Elimination of all vestiges of segregation in the faculties, administrations, curricula and environments of the historically white universities.

2). A complete remedy for the harm Black citizens suffer caused by the racially discriminatory restriction of the missions of the historically Black universities.

3). A complete remedy for discrimination against Black citizens with respect to land grant programming and funding, including a requirement that the State of Alabama operate Alabama A&M as a full-fledged land grant university, with equitable shares of all state and federal land grant appropriations, thus enabling it to carry out its land grant mission and to become fully desegregated.

b. The Alabama A&M Board of Trustees filed a similar appeal for the following reasons:

1). The $10.8 million facilities improvement funds ordered by the Court is inadequate.

2). Mission - Same as #2 in the Knight appeal.

3). Land Grant Funding - Same as #3 in the Knight Appeal.

4). The Court's rejection of the "institutional enhancement theory."

c. The Alabama State University Board of Trustees appealed because of:

1) The insufficiency of relief with respect to facilities, resources and funding, and program duplication.

2). The continued operation of Troy State University at Montgomery.

3). The failure of the Order to provide sufficient relief to enable the Board to carry out the Court's Order requiring further desegregation of Alabama State University.

d. The Alabama State Board of Education filed a cross appeal with the Eleventh Circuit regarding:

1). The determination of liability and liability for purposes of attorneys' fees, as to the Board, its members, the Chancellor, Athens State College, and Calhoun State Community college.

2). The granting of additional relief in favor of the private plaintiffs as against, and specifically related to the above defendants.

2. Motions to Stay the Order

Motions to seek a stay of the Court's Remedial Decree were filed by the State of Alabama, The University of Alabama and Troy State University, pending the final resolutions of the appeals that were filed with the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals. The District Court denied the motions.

3. Motion for Modification of the Court's Remedial Decree

The United States proposed that language be added to the Court's Remedial Decree to address proposed and future proposed construction and expansion programs undertaken in the Montgomery and Huntsville areas.The motion which was denied, would have given ACHE the authority to determine if such actions would unnecessarily duplicate programs already in place at ASU or A&M, or impede the desegregation of ASU and A&M. The Court ruled that it would be inappropriate to modify a Remedial Decree which is before the Eleventh Circuit Court of Appeals, and over which that Court is exercising jurisdiction.

4. Interim Award of Attorneys' Fees

The Court granted interim awards of $500,000 and $100,000 to two of the Plaintiffs" attorneys. The fees are to be made available from the appropriations for "Operations and Maintenance and Program Support" from the Alabama Special Education Trust Fund for bachelor-degree granting institutions."

PBM/8/11/92

LOUISIANA

U.S. VS LOUISIANA

CHRONOLOGY

1964	Title 6 of Civil Rights Act enacted--prohibits federal funding for any institution which practices discrimination.
1969	HEW (without a hearing) determines that 15 southern states are in violation of Title 6. Louisiana refuses to submit plan since it believes that its open admissions policy and other actions constitutes compliance.
1974	HEW refers case to the U.S. Justice Department. U.S. Justice Department files suit against Louisiana seeking compliance with Title VI and the 14th Amendment.

CASE LIES DORMANT

1979	Active negotiations commence.
1981	Following two years of intense negotiations and on the courthouse steps, agreement is reached and the 3 judge panel of the District Court approves the Consent Decree.
1987	Just prior to expiration of Consent Decree, U.S. Justice Department moves the Court for additional relief.
1988	On August 2, 1988, the Court enters an order finding Louisiana liable and ordering the State to submit a remedial plan. Parties are unable to agree on a plan.
1989	On July 19, 1989, the Court issues a plan based largely on a suggested plan from a special master appointed by the Court. The plan was amended and reissued on August 4th.
1989	In September, all defendants appealed Court's order directly to the U.S. Supreme Court as well as to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals.
1990	On January 8, 1990, the U.S. Supreme Court dismisses the Appeal "for want of Jurisdiction". The 3 judge panel is dissolved and Judge Schwartz assumes sole responsibility.

1990	On August 29, 1990, the Fifth Circuit remands the case to Judge Schwartz with instructions to revise the implementation dates of his original order.
1990	On September 28, 1990, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, meeting en banc, rules in favor of the state of Mississippi in its desegregation case.
1990	On October 30, 1990, relying on the Ayers case, Judge Schwartz vacates his August, 1988 decision and grants summary judgement in favor of Louisiana, dismissing the plaintiffs order with prejudice. Judge revises his plan so that it can be implemented in case the Ayers decision is reversed on appeal.
1990	In December, 1990, the U.S. Justice Department and Southern University appeal Judge Schwartz's finding of summary judgement for the State of Louisiana.
1991	On April 15, 1991, the U.S. Supreme Court agrees to review the Ayers decision.
1991	On May 6, 1991, the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals stays any further proceedings of the Louisiana case pending the outcome of the disposition of the Ayers case.
1992	On June 16, 1992, the U.S. Supreme Court vacated the judgement in the Ayers case and remanded it to the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals for further proceedings consistent with its opinion (U.S. vs Fordice).
1992	In August, 1992, U.S. Justice Department requests that the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals remand Louisiana's case back to Judge Schwartz at the Federal District Court.
1992	On September 10, 1992, Judge Schwartz issues an order for all parties to appear before him on September 30, 1992, to show him why he should not reissue his 1990 remedial plan.
1992	On September 25, 1992, Judge Schwartz agrees to a continuance until November 2, 1992, to give all parties an opportunity to reach a compromise.

1992	In November, Judge Schwartz agrees to allow additional time to allow the parties further opportunities to negotiate a comprise.
1992	On December 18, 1992, Judge Schwartz holds a hearing to receive additional information prior to issuing his order.
1992	On December 23, 1992, Judge Schwartz issues his remedial order which, with the exception of removing the merger of the LSU and SU Law Schools, tracks closely his 1990 remedial order.
1993	On January 8, 1993, the U.S. Justice Department files a Motion for Reconsideration and to Alter or Amend Judgement.
1993	On January 20, 1993, Judge Schwartz issues Orders and Reasons denying the U.S. Justice Department's Motion for Reconsideration and to Alter or Amend Judgement.
1993	On January 21, 1993, the Louisiana Attorney General, acting on behalf of the State of Louisiana, files a notice of appeal with the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit.

deseg\chronolo
1/27/93

MISSISSIPPI

KEY DATES IN AYERS

January 28, 1975	Private Plaintiffs filed a class action lawsuit. The Private Plaintiffs are black citizens of the State of Mississippi, including black students attending or desirous of attending public institutions of higher learning in Mississippi, black taxpayers residing in the State of Mississippi, and parents of black students attending public institutions of higher learning in the State of Mississippi. This original suit was filed against the public senior colleges and universities and the sixteen public junior colleges.
April 21, 1975	The United States filed its complaint to intervene in the Ayers suit.
September 17, 1975	The Federal Court ordered the separation for trial purposes of the claims against the senior colleges and universities from the claims against the sixteen public junior colleges.
January 28, 1975 to April 27, 1987	For approximately twelve (12) years, the parties attempted to settle the lawsuit.
April 27, 1987	Trial of Ayers case in District Court. The trial lasted five (5) weeks -- 71 witnesses testified and 56,700 pages of exhibits were introduced into evidence.
December 10, 1987	The Trial Court announced its decision finding that the State had fulfilled its affirmative duty to dismantle its prior system by adopting and implementing good faith racially neutral policies and practices when all students were truly free to attend institutions of their choice.
1990	The Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals affirmed the decision of the Trial Court.
June 26, 1992	The United States Supreme Court found that the lower courts had used the wrong legal standard and remanded the case to the lower

	courts for consideration in light of the proper legal standard.
October 22, 1992	The Trial Court held its first hearing after the Supreme Court remanded the case. Responding to the Trial Court's order that the parties present a remedy to the remnants of the prior system discussed by the Supreme Court, the Defendants presented a proposed remedy. The plaintiffs did not submit a proposed remedy.
April 12, 1993	The Trial Court held its second hearing and directed that discovery would be permitted for a period of six (6) months.
June 30, 1993	Exchange of discovery responses between Plaintiffs, United States Justice Department and Defendants.
July 19, 1993	Discovery Conference before United States Magistrate Judge in Oxford where discovery procedural matters were discussed.

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
GREENVILLE DIVISION

JAKE AYERS, JR., ET AL	PLAINTIFFS
and	
UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	PLAINTIFF/INTERVENOR
V.	CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:75CV9-B-D
KIRK FORDICE, GOVERNOR, STATE OF MISSISSIPPI, ET AL.	DEFENDANTS

DEFENDANTS' PROPOSED DISCOVERY PLAN

1. The deadline for motions to compel discovery was extended from August 13 to September 13. Responses to any such motions shall be served September 28. A hearing on such motions, if necessary, shall be held on October 4.

2. OCR documents requested by defendants shall be made available for inspection and copying beginning September 27.

3. Motions to add parties or amend the pleadings must be served no later than September 30.

4. Additional written discovery requests from any party shall not be allowed except upon order of the Court. Application for such an order must set forth the proposed requests in full and detailed grounds for their tardiness.

5. Discovery depositions of fact witnesses shall be taken between October 18 and December 3. The scope of such depositions shall be limited to the time period 1986 forward. Each fact deposition shall be concluded within four hours or less.

6. Plaintiffs and the United States shall designate their expert witnesses on or before October 15. Defendants shall designate their expert witnesses on or before November 15.

7. Depositions of the expert witnesses for the plaintiffs and United States shall be conducted between January 3, 1994 and January 21, 1994. Depositions of the expert witnesses for defendants shall be conducted between January 24, 1994 and February 11, 1994.

8. Discovery shall be concluded by February 28, 1994.

9. Other motions, with the exception of *in limine* motions, shall be served no later than March 31, 1994.

10. By February 15, 1994, the Court will establish the date for the pretrial conference and the date for trial.

TENNESSEE

TENNESSEE Higher Education Commission

NED McWHERTER
Governor
ARLISS L. ROADEN
Executive Director

Commission Members
WALTER LEE PRICE CHAIRMAN
LEWIS R. DONELSON
JOE LANCASTER
JOHN L. PARISH
HERMAN POSTMA
C. BRENT POULTON
J. BRAD REED
A C WHARTON
JOAN WILLIAMS
ROBERT F. WORTHINGTON JR

PARKWAY TOWERS, SUITE 1900
404 JAMES ROBERTSON PARKWAY
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE 37219-5380
(615) 741-3605

MEMORANDUM

TO: Arliss Roaden

FROM: Mattielyn Williams MW

DATE: August 20, 1987

SUBJECT: Chronology* of Important Dates in the Geier Case, Updated to August 20, 1987

1968

5-21-68 Plaintiff's motion to enjoin construction of UTN and dismantle the dual system

7-22-68 U.S. Dept. of Justice intervened as a party plaintiff. Sought injunction against UTN building; sought an order requiring defendants to submit a statewide desegregation plan

8-8-68 Court Hearing

8-24-68 Court Order
Defendants to submit a plan by 4-1-69 to desegregate the public higher educational institutions in the state, with particular attention to TSU

8-23-68 Court Opinion
Court finds that the dual system originally created by law has not yet been dismantled, and that the proposed construction of UTN will not be necessarily perpetuate a dual system, in part because UT has no intention to make the Nashville Center a degree-granting day institution; that the state's affirmative action duty is not satisfied by the "naked fact of an open door policy at TSU or at the other institutions; and that the court should order defendants to submit a plan designed to effect such desegregation--especially at TSU--as to indicate the dismantling of the current dual system. "The one thing that is absolutely essential is a substantial desegregation of" TSU

1969

1-13 / 2-11-69	Joint operation of UTN by SBR and UT considered; joint faculty appointments for UTN faculty members with neighboring institutions considered; operation of UTN by MTSU, UT and TSU considered, with locating UTN physically near to TSU.
2-15-69	"Summary of major considerations of the sub-committee of the Ad Hoc Committee of the University on the Issue: Court Order for Desegregation" (a TSU document) Suggestions which should be made to consultants: (1) exclusive programs at TSU; (2) locate UT Center adjacent to TSU campus; (3) TSU control of UT Center; (4) improved recruitment and image activities; (5) desegregation at all levels, beginning with the Board.
3-3-69	AAUP position statement on the desegregation case
4-1-69	Defendants' Plan for Achieving Meaningful Desegregation of Public Colleges and Universities and for Abolishing a Dual System of Higher Education
4-1-69	Individual Plaintiffs' Memorandum of Criteria Concerning Disestablishment of Dual System of Higher Education in Tennessee
4-2-69	Court Order Gave individual plaintiff's and the plaintiff intervenor until 5-1-69 to file objections to the state's plan. This was extended to 5-12 at plaintiff's request.
5-9-69	OBJECTIONS OF UNITED STATES TO DEFENDANTS PROPOSED PLAN OF DESEGREGATION Memorandum in Support of Objections of United States to Defendants' Proposed Plan of Desegregation Argues that the plan is not designed to effect such desegregation as to indicate the dismantling of the existing dual system as required by 8-21-68 court order. Requests a hearing on the adequacy of the plan and the feasibility of alternatives. Objections: (1) plan is not comprehensive and system wide; (2) plan is not specific--can't tell what steps defendants will take or when; (3) the plan appears to countenance a continuation of discriminatory practices; (4) plan does not contain a method for monitoring progress. Justice wants joint operation of UT Center, with each institution offering courses at the other.
5-12-69	Individual Plaintiff's Critique of State Plan

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1970

1-13-70 Nashville Higher Education Development Committee established: Folger, Hal Ramer (Ass't Commissioner Dept. Ed.), Torrence, Jack Williams (Academic V-P, UT), Gene Upshaw (UT Center) Committee established to prepare progress report and to develop additional recommendations re cooperative arrangements between TSU and UTN.

4-1-70 Defendants Report on Implementation of Desegregation Plans. First progress report to the Court. (Report showed no change in (1.0% in 1968 and 1969) enrollment of white students at TSU; white faculty went from 10% to 11% - an increase of 2 white faculty. Statewide increase in black students = 42.2 percent. (A voluminous report; contains a host of program development plans).

5-26-70 Victor Ashe letter to Folger. Has anyone considered merger under UT System?

5-29-70 Statement of Position Issued by the TSU Faculty argues that the upgrading of UT Center to campus status is a threat to the future development of TSU; and that other states have proceeded more equitably and soundly in similar circumstances: Kentucky (KY State College), West Virginia (West Va State College), and Missouri (Lincoln University).

6-3-70 Plaintiff's Motion for Further Relief Argument that 4-1-69 plan, and 4-1-70 report did not set forth a plan for dismantling the dual system, as ordered by the court.

6-18-70 UTN Visiting Committee report (Visited April 8-10, 1970) Recommends adoption of an ultimate role and scope for the Center; greater autonomy; more authority for chief officer; appointment of chief academic officer; development of other staff. (Committee comments throughout on the conflict between current role and scope, and UT plans and aspirations for the center.)

10-29-70 Report of Ad Hoc Committee to Identify Selected Areas of Cooperation between TSU and UTN. Most suggestions have to do with faculty exchange and offering of courses or each others campus committee. Also called for more formal establishment of dialogue (a permanent rather than an ad hoc committee) and doing away with barriers to student participation in programs at both institutions e.g. double registration, different fee structures, transportation, etc.

12-14-70 "Nashville Center of the University of Tennessee" becomes "UTN" upon recommendation of THEC. (THEC staff report included a recommendation that THEC submit a joint program proposal (engineering) to Judge Gray if TSU and UTN could not agree on a proposal of their own within 30 days. This recommendation was amended by the Commissioner to: UTN and TSU can offer undergraduate degrees in general engineering on condition that they implement their agreements for a joint program in general engineering. Students in either school are to have the option of receiving a joint degree in general engineering granted by both schools.

1971

1-31-71	Meeting of Nashville Higher Education Planning Committee
3-8-71	Nicks memo to Boling re meeting of institutional reps on 3-5-71 concerning development of cooperative graduate programs among UTN, TSU, MTSU. MBA: MTSU and UTN will develop separate programs; TSU not planning to participate in graduate business at this time. Ed.S.: All three are interested; a committee has been set up to develop a cooperative program.
4-19-71	Report of House Subcommittee on Relations of TSU and UTN Rep. Love asked Folger if the state has enough money to support two first-class full-scale institutions in Nashville. Folger felt this could not be justified.
5-17-71	Court Order Sets hearing for 6-14-71 to consider defendants plan of 4-1-69 and progress report of 4-1-70; a critique of the plan by plaintiffs, Justice's objections to plan, and plaintiffs' motion for further relief. At the hearing, all parties can make known their present opinion re progress and the ultimate workability of the plan. Court will also consider suggestions for workable alternatives in light of the court holding in the Alabama State Teachers Assoc. vs Alabama Public School and College Authorities.
6-14-71	Court hearing on motion for further relief Defendants filed (an unexpected) desegregation progress report Court re-scheduled hearing date to allow time for court and parties to study defendants' progress report.
6-15-71	Court hearing and Court order on motion for further relief Court directed counsel to file statements of positions and proposed orders.
7-12-71	Brief of state officials (defendants) in response to 6-15 court directive. State's plan is workable if given time; state will try to make TSU more attractive, program and facilities-wise; merger will not bring about greater desegregation because students in Nashville have options re private institutions. Besides, the Court can't require a merger without running counter to ruling in the Alabama Case (See 2/3/72). Court should deny relief to plaintiffs, "at least until defendants have been given a reasonable time to implement their plan.
7-13-71	H. Lynn Greer (Member State Board of Ed.) letter to Folger; it's time that the appropriate officials sat down and worked out a merger.
7-15-71	Court order in Alabama case.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7-22-71	Folger memo to Stimbert Improving the image at TSU. Want to discuss certain suggestions at next Board meeting: (1) merger of graduate programs in education of TSU-UTN; (2) TSU should accelerate development of school of allied health; (3) TSU should upgrade admissions standards--Folger proposed a schedule for this; (4) phase out of agricultural program; (5) develop an outstanding program at TSU; (6) re-route Centennial Blvd. out of the center of the campus; et al. These ideas may not work and we may have to try others, but some initiative is required to keep TSU from going into a decline. If there is one thing that is clear it is that "business as usual" won't work.
10-4-71	Torrence paper: Proposal for Effecting the Desegregation of TSU. Proposes joint operation of UTN; says increases in white faculty wall lead to increases in white students; a common feature in deseg. of black institutions is part-time night enrollment; rejects idea that admissions standards be raised.
12-6-71	Meeting: Nashville Higher Education Planning Committee This group has the same name as the committee which has been in existence since early 1970, but at this meeting it was expanded to include two members from each of the three Boards).

1972

2-3-72	Court memorandum and order Defendants are to submit a plan for implementation in the 1972 school year which will provide, at a minimum for substantial desegregation of TSU faculty, and for allocation of programs to TSU which will "assure...a substantial white presence on the campus." Report to Court due 3-15-72. Also, a report on additional measures to be taken should be filed by 8-1-72, and this should include a report on the feasibility of a merger. Also, the court can require what is necessary to dismantle the system - consistent with the Alabama case.
2-14-72	Torrence discussion paper Proposals for Effecting the Desegregation of TSU. Lists: (a) special financial aid for white students; (b) establishment of off-campus associate degree granting programs (TSU would establish two off-campus institutions in Nashville); (c) urban center; (d) new programs: communications arts, transportation, special ed, environmental engineering.
2-15-72	Folger discussion paper Response to Federal Court Desegregation Order of 2-3-72 Considers merger and non-merger options

2-19-72 Folger discussion paper

Specific proposals for desegregating TSU

1. All faculty replacements to be white
2. Faculty exchange program among UTN, TSU, APSU, for Fall '72 MTSU, Volunteer State
3. New programs at TSU staffed by whites (same programs as Torrence suggested)
4. Development of off-campus community college program by TSU
5. Encourage employment of TSU faculty by other public institutions
6. Scholarships for white students
7. UTN must discontinue all graduate education offerings at end of summer '72 or merge TSU and UTN graduate education activities. (In discussions on this UTN was willing to have joint program with two degrees; 50 percent work on "other campus").
8. Work out joint plan for graduate education in Nashville (MTSU, Peabody, TSU-UTN) in order to minimize duplication and facilitate student interchange.
9. TSU evening courses to be offered at UTN
10. Upgrade TSU campus
11. Raise TSU academic standards (e.g. a separate university college for all students with ACT of less than 16)

3-10-72 Court Order

Amends 2-3-72 order. Changes plan due date from 3-15-72 to 3-27-72.

3-27-72 Defendants Fall 1972 Interim Plan

Plan for further desegregation of TSU in the Fall of 1972

Seven point plan:

1. TSU will employ white faculty to fill all vacancies
2. Faculty exchange program among TSU and other Middle Tennessee institutions
3. Ten non-black faculty will be added at TSU in areas where a strengthened faculty would be likely to attract white students
4. Financial aid program to attract white students
5. Expanded recruitment program for non-blacks
6. Improve physical appearance of TSU
7. UT School of Social Work to TSU campus plan suggests that other program developments might be located at TSU in Fall 1972: graduate education, joint graduate education program between UTN and TSU; TSU courses offered at UTN and other off-campus locations; development of allied health programs at TSU.

6-2-72 Folger memo to Pack (AG)
Wants to know if Fall 1972 plan is acceptable to the Court. Reluctant to go to the expense of moving School of Social Work without a court order because TSU faculty is very critical of the plan. Otherwise, progress in implementing the plan has been nearly non-existent. We promised the Court 50-60 additional white faculty at TSU--there are only 7 more. Faculty are not very willing to participate in exchanges. The new SBR needs to be involved in development of the long range plan, can we delay submission to November 1972?

6-15-72 Court Order
Court indicated it would reserve judgment on 3-27-72 plan until receipt of 8-1-72 report. Defendants should address themselves to the effectiveness of the proposals in the 3-27 plan; project the success of the "other areas of program development;" and set forth any new programs which have been developed since 3-27-72. This is the second time the court has reserved judgment on a plan.

7-6-72 Original plaintiffs' interrogatories (second set)
Answers to be filed within 30 days

7-10-72 First meeting of Board of Regents
Board moved to request a delay beyond 8-1-72 for filing report to court

7-15-72 THEC report on steps needed to desegregate public higher education in Tennessee. "The only successful large scale desegregation of formerly black institutions has come by attracting adult, largely part-time, commuting students, mostly enrolling in evening classes. This is the type of students that UTN has been developed to serve, and UTN provides the biggest competition to TSU in its efforts to attract white students." MTSU also offers substantial competition. UTK graduate education program at UTN, as well as all undergraduate teacher education courses at UTN, "should be phased out by June 1973." Also, there should be no off-campus education courses in Davidson County except TSU's. Concerning the feasibility of a merger: not feasible at this time, but it may be necessary at some time in the future to complete the desegregation process and to eliminate duplication and overlapping of programs. Successful merger will depend upon greater similarity in educational objectives, admissions standards, and evaluation standards than currently exists.

7-19-72 Progress Report on Implementation of Desegregation Plans for Fall, 1972 (written by Folger) reports on seven steps in 3-27-72 plan.

7-20-72 Torrence letter to Stimbert
Expresses "disappointment" re Tennessean leak captioned; "TSU Heads to Proposed Merger"

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

7-20-72	Torrence letter to Dwight Lewis Costigates Lewis for betrayal of confidence in publishing 7-20 article in Tennessean
7-28-72	Boling letter to UT Board Conveys UT statement for inclusion in 8-1-72 plan. UT willing to help out at TSU in any way; recommends continuation of existing cooperative programs; full implementation of 3-27 plan; cooperative program in graduate education; new (unspecified) cooperative programs; consortium of UTN, TSU and MTSU to offer all graduate programs in Middle Tennessee
7-28-72	Dunn letter to Torrence Approves, as Chairman of SBR, TSU request to file a report to the court on behald of TSU
7-31-72	Avon Williams requests entry to case Motion for leave to intervene as plaintiffs,to add additional defendants and for a preliminary injunction Contains objections to defendants 3-27-72 plan; a request that plaintiff-intervenors be allowed to file their own plan; request that SBR be added as defendants; request for an injunction against establishment of new segregated institutions. Charges that original plaintiffs no longer represent interest of Tennessee black citizens and that Justice hasn't done anything since 1968.
7-31-72	Defendants report to court Submitted pursuant to court order of 2-3-72, as amended on 3-10 and 6-15. Contains: (1) progress report on implementation of desegregation plans for 1972; (2) a report on steps needed to desegregate public higher education. (This is a THEC report.); (3) individual response of UT. Notes that SBR is not submitting anything or endorsing anything submitted by anyone else. (No evidence that TSU submitted its report of 7-20-72)
9-1-72	Plaintiffs' response to Defendants Plan (8-1-72) Submitted by State of Tennessee Individual Plaintiffs' Recommendations for Court Order and Plan for Merger Plaintiffs' Proposed Opinion of Court
9-6-72	Defendants' Response to Motion to Intervene of Raymond Richardson Jr., et.al.
9-8-72	UT Board proposed $12.7 million expansion of UTN
9-29-72	Plaintiffs' motions- Motion for additional relief seeking preliminary and permanent injunction Motion for issuance of order for contempt of court order
10-18-72	Defendants' (UT's and State's) response to plaintiffs' motion for issuance of order for contempt of court and for additional relief

1973

2-23-73	Court order Allow intervention of plaintiff-intervenors Raymond Richardson, et.al, but denies their request to submit a new plan
4-11-73	Interrogatories filed
11-9-73	Plaintiff-Intervenor Richardson's motion to delay the setting of the case for hearing for a period of at least sixty days.

1974

1-14-74	Defendants' Progress Report: Equal Opportunity In Tennessee's Colleges and Universities, Fall 1973. Reviews progress re the seven steps in 3-27-72 plan.
2-15-74	Court Order Defendants to submit an interim plan for Fall 1974 by 3-8-74 (amended by court on 3-6 and 4-1-74) and a long range plan by 8-1-74. The 2-14 report shows that progress has been minimal, especially at TSU. After the 8-1-74 plan is filed the court will allow 15 days for objections then a date for a hearing will be set.
3-27-74	Depositions taken
4-1-74	UT, THEC and SBR interim plans Transfer of UTN graduate education programs to TSU for Fall 1974
4-1-74	Response of Justice to interim plans Defendants should show why additional programs (undergraduate education and engineering) should not be moved to TSU. With certain modifications we can agree with THEC plan; needs to be made more specific. Question of merger should be decided when a hearing is held on the long range plan to be filed 8-1-74
4-10-74	UT objections to 4-1-74 interim plan filed by THEC + SBR Plan is educationally unsound and does not ensure additional desegregation.
4-10-74	Williams' objections to interim plan
4-11-74	Amendment to objections of plaintiff - intervenors Requests disapproval of interim plan and that plaintiff-intervenors be allowed to submit their own plan.
4-16-74	Court hearing on interim plan and objections to it

4-19-74	Court Order Court finds that exclusive program allocation is one proper approach to interim action. Court confined this action to the program propoals, and then ordered transfer of the graduate education program only, due to the complexity of such a transfer. File a plan containing detailed procedures within 30 days.
5-17-74	Steele's law firm requests entry in case for UT
5-17-74	UT Notice of Appeal re: 4-19-74 court order
5-17-74	UT Motion to Stay 4-19-74 order
5-20-74	UT response' to court order of 4-19-74
5-20-74	Defendants response to order and motion for extension. THEC wants an additional three weeks to prepare materials requested by Court on 4-19-74 Conveys: Plan for terminating the Graduate Education Program at UTN and expanding the Program at TSU.
5-20-74	Williams' supplemental interrogatories to defendants' answers due 6-11-74
5-21-74	UT brief in support of Motion to Stay
5-22-74	Court Order Grants THEC until 6-10-74 to complete interim plan
6-74	Consultants selected (agreed upon by Folger, Boling, Humphreys). Letter of invitation sent by Folger on May 30. James Godard, SREB Robert French, University of Alabama at Birmingham Anne Pruitt, Case-Western Reserve University Prince Jackson-Savannah State College
6-5-74	Ad Hoc Committee on desegregation formed to develop a long range plan. THEC - Armstrong, Boyd, Hawkins UT Trustees - Furrow, Miller, York (McDowell was the alternate who attended when another could not) State Board of Regents - Jones, Martin, Taylor
6-7-74	TSU paper Plan for expanding the evening program at TSU
6-10-74	THEC - further plans for terminating the graduate program in education filed with court
6-11-74	Answers to Williams' supplemental interrogatories filed with court
6-12-74	Response to the State of Tennessee to UT's Motion to Stay
6-16-74	Consultant's first visit to Tennessee, June 16, 18

6-17-74	First meeting of the Ad Hoc Committee
6-24-74	Court Order Plaintiffs have filed a motion for an injunction.
6-29-74	UT National Alumni Assoc. letter to Folger conveys resolution calling for continuation of UTN
7-2-74	Court Order Denies UT's 5-17 Motion to Stay
7-5-74	Court Order Approves 6-10 plan for transfer of graduate education program and urges THEC to consider additional similar and other means, "known better to the educators than the court" for strengthening the interim plan.
7-15-74	Consultants in Nashville July 15-16 to present their report.
7-16-74	Ad Hoc Committee, instructed staff persons to prepare the detailed "Long Range Plan" consistent with the consultants' recommendations. Plan prepared by staff, with assistance of appropriate campus administrators, between July 16 and July 24.
7-24-74	Ad Hoc Committee met on July 24 to review the proposed Long-Range Plan. After thorough discussion among themselves and with staff representatives, the Committee officially endorsed the plan and recommended its approval by the governing boards and the Commission.
7-25-74	Long-Range Plan approved the State Board of Regents and the UT Board of Trustees.
7-26-74	Long Range Plan approved by THEC
7-31-74	Plaintiff-Intervenor Richardson's Plan filed with U.S. District Court.
8-9-74	THEC - Report of Action Taken to Implement the 4-19 interim plan filed with Court in response to concerns expressed on 7-5-74
9-11-74	Response of Plaintiff-Intervenor Richardson et.al to Defendants' Long Range Plan.
10-9-74	Justice Department's Response and Objections to State's Plan
10-10-74	Original Plaintiffs' Motion to Strike Plaintiff-Intervenors; Richardson's 8-1-74 plan. Justice's response to objection. Memorandum in Support of Motion.
10-15-74	Long Range Plan of Original Plaintiffs. Rumors that Justice has recommended a complete takeover by TSU to Judge Gray.
10-24-74	Nicks memo to Prados: Response to Justice's objections to State Plan

12-74 Several depositions taken

1975

1-5-75 Reaction of TSU to merger proposal presented by Attorney General's office. Humphries agrees with proposal to merge UTN under TSU, but rejects UT governance of TSU.

1-75 Several depositions taken.

2-13-75 Plaintiffs' Motion for leave to file an amended and Supplemental Plan (Contains an outline of the proposed plan)

2-13-75 Plaintiffs' Motion for Preliminary Injunction asks court to enjoin UT from appointing a permanent Chancellor of UTN until plaintiffs' supplemental plan is filed.

2-13-75 Plaintiffs' Motion for Substitution of Parties (Blanton for Dunn; Ingram for Carmichael).

2-21-75 Report of Ad Hoc Committee
Ad Hoc Committee directed SBOR, UT System, and THEC staffs to:
(Minutes - see Boling's 4-4-75 letter to UT Committee members)

(a) update and make more specific the portions of the Long Range Plan (LRP) dealing with minority students, faculty, administrative, and clerical staff goals. The steps which will be taken to attain these goals should be identified.

(b) identify in a more complete and detailed way the cooperative steps to be take by TSU and UTN to increase other race representation in the student bodies, faculty and administrative staffs of each institution.

2-27-75 Buchanan memo to File
Nicks, Humphreys (C.C.), Buchanan, Boling, Prados, Haille, Folger, Stovall
How should the LRP be strengthened
Nicks reviewed Fred Humphries' suggestions with the group. Group agreed on five next steps: (1) THEC will begin to update statistical data in plan; (2) Nicks will write a plan for the recomposition of the UT Board and will contact Blanton about it; (3) Prados and Buchanan will get together with Humphries to draft more definitive role and scope statements for UTN and TSU; (4) Prados, Stovall, and Buchanan will meet to discuss faculty and staff goal projections; (5) the group will reconvene when above steps are completed.

4-8-75 THEC staff paper resulting from 3-4-75 meeting
Some Factors to be Considered in Determining the Adequacy of Minority Enrollment Goals

5-20-75	Progress Report on Implementation of Desegregation Plans filed with Court by THEC
7-21-75	THEC position statement on Long Range Plan
11-17-75	Brown affidavit to Court. Monitoring Committee established; report to be filed within 90 days
11-24-75	THEC preliminary addendum to the plan, November 7 & 14 drafts
12-5-75	THEC staff paper: Assessing Impact on Desegregation
12-19-75	Monitoring Committee met
1-7-76	Court hearing on defendant's objections to interrogatories Several affidavits taken Judge Gray's order to provide all available information
1-19-76	Court Order to provide visiting committee reports
2-5-76	Meeting of Monitoring Committee. Committee recessed to allow members to read its sub-committee report. Vote will occur in a 2-9-76 conference call.
2-9-76	Monitoring Committee adopted Desegregation Progress Report and moved to forward it to the Court.
	Motion to Plaintiff-Intervenor to Compel Discovery Objection to adequacy of defendants' answers to Williams 12-15-75 interrogatories.
2-13-76	Defendant Higher Education Commission Answers Plaintiff-Intervenor United States Department of Justice's Requests of 12-15-76.
2-15-76	Defendants' Desegregation Progress Report Filed with Court 2-17-76
3-1-76	Various tables compare per student appropriations for operations and capital outlay among senior institutions: 1951-75.
3-10-76	Williams' motion to extend discovery period to 3-25-76.
4-8-76	Court hearing Re: Senator Williams' Motion to Compel Discovery
4-9-76	Judge Northrop's decision in the Maryland Case
4-12-76	Desegregation Monitoring Committee meeting minutes prepared. Informal recommendations and questions for Mr. Armstrong from THEC staff

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

6-3-76	Commission action re: TSU-UTN Joint Engineering Program
6-9-76	Desegregation Monitoring Committee meeting
6-17-76	Nicks approves TSU plans for use of special $100,000 appropriation
6-18-76	Motion for Summary Judgment/Brief and Argument in support
7-14-76	Casey makes notes re: "Loss of racial identifiability" criterion
8-13-76	Senator Williams' response to motion for Summary Judgment
8-14-76	Justice's response to Motion for Summary Judgment
8-25-76	Desegregation Progress 1969-75 - Report to Legislature
9-7-76	Court Order Sets trial date (9-20) and rejects motion for summary judgment
10-12-76	Draft revised long-range minority enrollment goals
11-15-76	Casey correspondence with Drew Days Copy of California Supreme Court Decision: Bakke case
12-17-76	Desegregation Monitoring Committee meeting Proceedings and related documents

1977

1-31-77	Court Memorandum (Findings of fact and conclusions of law)
2-9/2-11-77	SBR Merger plans - drafts
2-10-77	Meeting of Desegregation Monitoring Committee
2-12-77	UT Trustees: Resolution Opposing Merger
2-15-77	TSU's Principles of Merger and 'Implementation Guidelines'
	Monitoring Committee's 75-76 Progress Report filed with Court
	TSU Alumni Assoc. Mailgram to Brown- Allow TSU admin. to draft merger plan
2-22-77	Haynes letter to Judge Gray Conveys proposed judgment; SBR draft merger plan and notifies Court that TSU disagrees with part of judgment
	Proposed judgments filed by Haynes, Steele, Justice Dept, Williams, Barrett

2-23-77	Letter to Brown and Nicks from UTN faculty senate Convey UTN's "Conceptual Plan" for consolidation and notifies that UTN faculty senate has filed a motion to intervene in case
2-28-77	Court Judgment and Court Order requiring Merger
3-14-77	UT Trustees vote to appeal
4-18-77	SBR develops Merger Plan
6-13-77	Senator Williams objects to Merger Plan and files Motion for Further Relief
6-17-77	Court rejects Williams' June motion
6-21-77	Williams moves for an extension of time to file record on appeal
	Steele-Motion to Reconsider 6/17 Motion
7-29-77	UT Motion to Stay
8-19-77	SBR response to UT Stay Motion
8-22-77	Court denies Stay request
8-26-77	Steele-Motion to Reconsider Denial of Stay Order
undated	Court denies Steele's motion
11-22-77	6th Circuit Appeal briefs on the merger filed

1978

3-78/11-78	Additional 6th Circuit briefs filed

1979

4-13-79	Court of Appeals upholds Judge Gray's 2/28 order
4-30-79	UT files Motion to Stay pending US Supreme Court review
5-2-79	THEC files Motion to Stay pending US Supreme Court review
5/79	SBR and US Dept. of Justice file Motion in Opposition of Stay
7-6-79	UT files Petition for Writ of Certiorari
8-13-79	UTN AAUP Chapter files Motion for leave to file amicus curiae
10-1-79	US Supreme Court denies motion for Certiorari

1980

1-17-80	Firm of Willis and Knight files motion to withdraw as counsel for THEC; AG's office assumes representation of THEC
12-31-80	Plaintiff intervenors Richardson et al. file motion for additional injunctive relief claiming little progress has been made

1981

5-8-81	Plaintiffs move to add additional named plaintiffs composed of TSU faculty and students
5-21-81	Defendants, except UT, file Memorandum in Opposition to the Addition of More Plaintiffs
8-24-81	Court sets hearing date of November 23-25, '81, on attorney's fees, re-examination of the statewide plan, and the motion to add members to the plaintiff class specifically to challenge the TSU portion of the plan
10-7-81	Hearings Rescheduled for January 4-6

1982

2-18-82	1981 Desegregation Progress Report filed
10-12-82	Motion to Determine the Status of the Case and Motion for Further Relief filed by plaintiffs, citing TSU resegregation

1983

8-9-83	McGinnis et al. apply to intervene. Applicants for intervention are primarily white faculty members and students from TSU
8-16-83	Defendants oppose McGinnise et al. intervention
10-17-83	Defendants file motion to dismiss claiming TSU merger was the final remedy in the case
10-31-83	McGinnis et al. file response against 10-17 motion

1984

2-10-84	Notice of Filing of the 1983 Desegregation Progress Report
5-84	McGinnis et al. develops a proposal to accelerate integration at TSU
5-84/6-84	McGinnis' interrogations, depositions, and requests for documents take place

6-84/7-84	Several draft stipulations of settlement are proposed by various parties, other than the Justice Dept.
8-2-84	Draft stipulation presented to Judge Wiseman
8-10-84	Dept. of Justice files Motion in Opposition to the Settlement
8-20-84	Dept. of Justice develops a stipulation proposal
9-84	Budget estimates developed projecting costs of proposed stipulation, for State defendants use only
9-25-84	Stipulation of Settlement, agreed to by all parties except the Justice Dept., is signed into law by the Court. Memorandum of Law issued.
10-84	Justice Dept. files Notice of Appeal in 6th Circuit
10-2-84	Adequacy of AG to represent THEC is questioned informally; issue surfaced around what Stipulation provision ID OCR forms to collect
10-84	UT and SBR institutions and Boards submit initial funding requests for desegregation to THEC staff. Requests modified and finalized in spring, '85.
10-84/present	Research required to be undertaken in the Stipulation is conducted. Plans for new programs required are developed for implementation.

1985

3-19-85	McGinnis et al. write AG's office and alledge lack of good faith with respect to certain personnel changes and administration policies at TSU
4-25-85	Court issues a temporary restraining order at the request of plaintiffs and plaintiff-intervenors blocking presidential appointments at TSU, DSCC and ClSCC, and the appointment of a new executive director at the THEC until a hearing can be held to determine whether or not the State is looking only at whites for the THEC, DSCC and ClSCC positions and only at blacks for the TSU position. Plaintiffs had sought the restraining order only for DSCC and ClSCC; Judge Wiseman extended the order to THEC and TSU on his own.
5-1-85	Injunction hearing held on the fairness of the position searches. The temporary restraining order was made a permanent injunction whose dissolution was contingent upon the State submitting an acceptable search procedure within 20 days and taking references to TSU as an 1890 land grant institution out of the position announcement. The State Board of Regents and THEC appeal the 5-1-85 injunction to the 6th Circuit.

5-13-85	THEC members address the Court of Appeals and the District Court indicating formally that they feel a conflict of interest has developed as the AG has attempted to represent all state defendants.
5-14-85	Court of Appeals dissolves the injunction with respect to THEC and modifed the injunction with respect to the SBR so that the injunction expires automatically upon their adoption of a good faith plan for the searches.
5-22-85	The Legislature supports little of the Governor's and the THEC's call for additional desegregation funds.
6-6-85	THEC's letter of May 13 is treated as a motion for new counsel. Court invites interested parties to respond.
6-13-85	Dept. of Justice 6th Circuit appeals brief filed challenging the whole case but focusing on the pre-professional school training program for 75 black sophomores. Ernest Terrell, one of the original named plaintiffs, files an appeals brief challenging the settlement on the grounds of his counsel's failure to secure his agreement prior to signing off on the Stipulation; objects chiefly to the TSU portions of the settlement.
6-26-85	Plaintiffs oppose THEC's motion AG opposes THEC's motion
7-2-85	Parties plaintiff write letter complaining about the low level of desegregation funding supported by the Legislature and request knowledge of the State's plan of action in light of that development.
8-9-85	State defendants' 6th Circuit brief filed
10-30-85	Plaintiffs Geier et al. and plaintiff-intervenors Richardson et al. file motion for further relief asking that desegregation funding be placed on the agenda for the Special Session of the Legislature that the Governor had called on the prison issue, in light of the low level of funding awarded in May '85
11-15-85	AG responds to 10-30 motion declaring that the State has done all that good faith requires and that to place desegregation funding, which has already been considered and declined, on the Special Session would fall outside of the normal budgetary process on which process the plaintiffs agreed to rely. The AG alledged that the District Court lacked the power to modify the settlement to require such extraordinary action since the case was on appeal; furthermore, that principles of federalism and comity require the federal courts to avoid intrusion into the Governor's decision to call and set the agenda for Special Legislative Sessions.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

1986

3-20-86	Barrett writes SBR Chancellor Thomas Garland urging appointment of a president at TSU
5-5-86	Desegregation Monitoring Committee meets; statistical report approved; new desegregation objectives deferred
6-27-86	Terrell case dismissed
7-17-86	Oral argument in Court of Appeals
8-6-86	Aleta Arthur for McGinnis et. al. files Motion for Further Relief, including investigation of merging TSU with MTSU, redefining the Desegregation Monitoring Committee, and demanding that a long-range objective be set for TSU
8-12-86	State responds to McGinnis et al.'s August 6 Motion asking that it be denied in its entirety
8-26-86	McGinnis et. al. serve first interrogatories and requests for production upon Commission Executive Director Arliss Roaden and SBR Chancellor Tom Garland
9-5-86	Court of Appeals affirms Geier
9-15-86	Desegregation Monitoring Committee approves new interim and long-range desegregation objectives for students and employees
11-13-86	New Objectives filed with Court

1987

1-87	Subsequent to election of new governor, the case name was changed to Geier v. McWherter.
1-23-87	Agreed order on discovery entered
1-27-87	McGinnis et. al's August 6 motion denied without prejudice; Court allows more experience under the Stipulation
3-87	Filing date of the annual progress report changed from November 30 to May 1
4-22-87	Desegregation Monitoring Committee approves 1986 Progress Report

MBW:gm

APPENDIX H

SUBGROUP MEAN RESPONSES

**A Survey Of Selected Public Policy-Makers In The Deep South
States Of Arkansas, Alabama, Louisiana, Mississippi
And Tennessee To Identify Their Attitudes And
Perceptions Of The Desegregation Process
of Higher Education**

Subgroup Mean Responses

COMPONENT	SHEEO'S		LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITIES		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITIES	
	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean
A. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE FOLLOWING AREAS ARE COMPONENTS OF A STATE'S OR A UNIVERSITY'S DESEGREGATION POLICIES:								
1. University Mission Statements	5	1.0000	9	1.4444	41	1.5366	7	1.2857
2. Closures/Mergers:								
A. of Programs	5	2.0000	10	2.2000	40	2.3250	7	2.1429
B. of Universities	5	2.0000	10	2.2000	40	2.5000	7	3.5714
3. Admission Requirements	5	2.0000	10	1.8000	41	1.9512	7	1.7143
4. Alumni Views	5	3.0000	9	2.1111	41	2.7805	6	2.1667
5. Student Views	5	2.4000	9	2.0000	41	2.3659	6	2.0000
6. Program Offerings	5	1.4000	9	1.7778	41	2.0976	7	1.2857

COMPONENT	SHEEO'S		LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITIES		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITIES	
	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean
7. State's Financial Resources	5	1.6000	9	1.8889	41	2.2439	6	1.1667
8. Reallocation of Existing Resources	5	1.6000	9	1.8889	41	2.2927	7	1.5714
9. Equity Funding for Past Disparity	5	1.8000	9	1.8889	41	2.6829	7	1.0000
10. Racial Representation on Governing Boards	5	1.8000	9	1.6667	41	1.8049	7	1.0000
B. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THESE EVENTS HAVE MERIT IN ACCOMPLISHING DESEGREGATION:								
1. Required Faculty Reassignment to Other Campuses	4	3.7500	10	2.9000	40	4.0500	7	3.5714
2. Other Race (Other race represents Black at HWU; White at HBU).								
A. Scholarship	4	2.5000	10	2.3000	41	2.0488	7	1.5714
B. Faculty-Appointment Incentives (e.g. early tenure, paid moving expenses)	4	2.5000	10	2.3000	40	2.3750	7	2.0000
3. Across Universities								
A. Equal Admissions	4	3.7500	10	2.5000	41	2.9268	7	3.4286
B. Equal Tuition	4	3.0000	10	2.7000	41	3.0244	7	2.7143

COMPONENT	SHEEO'S		LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITIES		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITIES	
	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean
C. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE APPROPRIATE IN A DESEGREGATED ENVIRONMENT:								
1. Single Race Institutions	5	3.8000	10	3.5000	41	3.6585	7	3.2857
2. Racial Quotas	5	3.4000	10	2.8000	41	3.6341	7	3.1429
3. Ethnic Studies	5	2.2000	10	2.2000	41	2.4390	7	1.5714
D. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THESE EVENTS HAVE SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVED DESEGREGATION EFFORTS IN HIGHER EDUCATION:								
1. Department Actions of the U.S. Government (e.g. HEW, Justice)	5	1/8000	10	1.9000	40	2.0500	7	1.5714
2. Integration in the Military	5	1.8000	10	2.0000	40	1.9250	6	2.0000
3. Desegregation of Public Schools	5	1.4000	10	1.8000	40	1.7000	7	2.0000
4. Lawsuits								
A. Adams versus Richardson	5	1.6000	7	1.5714	36	2.0556	6	1.8333
B. Brown versus Board of Education	5	1.6000	9	1.4444	39	1.6154	7	1.2857
C. Ayers versus Fordice	5	2.0000	9	2.2222	35	2.3714	7	2.4286

COMPONENT	SHEEO'S		LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITIES		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITIES	
	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean
E. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU FEEL THE FOLLOWING ARE BARRIERS TO STUDENT/FACULTY/STAFF DESEGREGATION:								
1. Being a minority placed within a majority	5	3.0000	10	2.1000	40	2.8500	7	3.0000
2. Feelings of comfort in being in the majority.	5	2.4000	10	2.4000	40	2.4000	7	2.8571
3. Availability of a comparable social community	5	3.4000	10	2.1000	39	2.0769	7	3.1429
F. PLEASE ASSESS THE INFLUENCE EACH OF THE FOLLOWING GROUPS HAS HAD ON DESEGREGATION EFFORTS:								
1. State Legislatures	5	2.8000	10	2.5000	40	3.0250	7	2.2857
2. Judicial Systems	5	2.2000	10	1.4000	41	1.7073	7	1.7143
3. U.S. Office of Civil Rights	5	2.2000	10	1.3000	41	2.0244	7	1.4286
4. Governing Boards	5	1.8000	10	2.5000	41	2.4634	6	2.5000
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	5	2.0000	10	2.5000	38	2.6316	5	2.4000
6. Faculty	4	2.7500	10	2.6000	40	2.6250	7	2.1429
7. Presidents/CEO's	5	2.2000	10	2.7000	40	1.9750	7	2.0000
8. Alumni	5	3.0000	10	2.8000	39	3.3333	7	2.2857

COMPONENT	SHEEO'S		LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITIES		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITIES	
	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean
9. Students	5	2.8000	10	2.3000	40	2.6750	7	2.2857
10. Interest & Special Groups	5	3.0000	9	2.1111	41	2.8293	7	3.0000
11. Individuals	5	3.0000	9	2.3333	41	2.4146	7	2.8571
12. Employers of Graduates	5	2.4000	9	2.3333	40	2.5250	7	2.5714
G. PLEASE ASSESS THE CHANGE IN ATTITUDES DURING THE LAST 17 YEARS TOWARD DESEGREGATION IN THE FOLLOWING GEOGRAPHICAL LOCATIONS:								
1. Nationally	5	2.0000	10	2.2000	40	2.2750	7	2.1429
2. Regionally	5	2.0000	10	2.3000	40	2.2250	7	2.2857
3. State	5	2.0000	10	2.2000	40	2.2000	7	2.2857
H. PLEASE ASSESS ATTITUDES TOWARD MORE EXTENSIVE DESEGREGATION WITHIN VARIOUS GROUPS:								
1. Alumni	5	2.6000	9	2.5556	40	2.6500	7	1.8571
2. Students	5	2.4000	9	2.3333	40	2.2750	7	1.5714
3. Faculty	5	2.0000	9	2.3333	40	2.1250	7	1.8571
4. Presidents	5	2.0000	9	2.1111	41	1.7805	7	1.5714

COMPONENT	SHEEO'S		LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITIES		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITIES	
	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean
5. State Higher Education Executive Officers (SHEEO)	5	2.0000	9	1.8889	39	2.0000	6	2.0000
6. Political Leaders	5	2.4000	9	2.2222	40	2.3750	7	2.5714
7. Special Interest Groups	5	2.2000	9	1.8889	39	2.4103	7	2.8571
I. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT THE EFFORTS TO DESEGREGATE HIGHER EDUCATION ARE IN CRISIS.	5	2.2000	10	1.9000	41	2.3902	7	1.7143
J. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH THE FOLLOWING INDIVIDUALS SPEND THEIR TIME ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES:								
1. Presidents	5	2.0000	10	2.6000	41	2.0732	7	2.0000
2. Legislators	5	3.0000	10	2.7000	40	2.8250	7	2.7143
3. State Governing Boards, SHEEO, Staff	5	1.8000	10	2.2000	41	2.3415	7	2.2857
K. PLEASE ASSESS THE AMOUNT OF TIME YOU SPEND ON DESEGREGATION ISSUES:	5	1.6000	10	2.6000	41	1.9268	7	1.4286
L. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT DESEGREGATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAS SIGNIFICANTLY RESULTED IN MOVING AFRICAN AMERICANS INTO THE MAINSTREAM OF SOCIETY.	5	1.8000	10	2.2000	40	1.8750	7	2.1429

COMPONENT	SHEEO'S		LEGISLATIVE CHAIRS		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY WHITE UNIVERSITIES		PRESIDENTS OF HISTORICALLY BLACK UNIVERSITIES	
	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean	Observations (Number)	Mean
M. PLEASE ASSESS THE EXTENT TO WHICH YOU AGREE THAT DESEGREGATION OF HIGHER EDUCATION HAS RESULTED IN ACCEPTANCE OF CULTURAL DIVERSITY BY INDIVIDUALS ON DESEGREGATED CAMPUSES.	5	2.0000	10	2.3000	40	2.1250	6	2.3333
1. A. The highest earned degree you now hold:	5	4.0000	10	2.1000	41	3.8537	7	4.0000
B. Highest degree earned is in the field of:	5	3.2000	10	3.0000	41	3.0488	7	2.2857
2. Undergraduate degree earned at:	5	2.0000	10	1.7000	41	1.9512	7	1.1429
3. Gender	5	1.2000	10	1.0000	41	1.0976	7	1.0000
4. Race	5	1.0000	10	1.3000	41	1.0732	7	2.0000
5. Age	5	2.6000	10	2.2000	41	2.3415	7	2.5714
6. A. The total number of years' experience in higher education, if appropriate:	5	3.0000	4	1.2500	41	3.0488	7	3.2857
B. The total number of years' experience in the legislature, if appropriate:	1	1.0000	10	2.0000	2	2.5000		
7. Your employment geographical location:	5	3.0000	10	3.0000	41	2.6341	7	3.4286
8. Would you consider responding to a follow-up questionnaire in five years or after the implementation of the Ayers Decision?	5	1.0000	9	1.0000	41	1.1463	7	1.0000
9. Would you like to see the results of this study?	5	1.0000	9	1.0000	41	1.1463	7	1.0000

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH OF THE AUTHOR

Margaret Ann Homer Cook is the Associate Commissioner of the Board of Trustees of State Institutions of Higher Learning, a position she has held since 1987. As Associate Commissioner, she is responsible for construction and physical affairs, information services, press, media and the University Press of Mississippi. Ms. Cook coordinates the eight public universities in the aforementioned areas. Additionally, a primary responsibility is serving as the twelve-member Board's Executive Secretary.

Ms. Cook is charged with administering IHL's statutory responsibilities with regard to accrediting the state's nursing degree programs. In a related role, she serves as Chair of the Mississippi Commission on College Accreditation, the agency responsible for accrediting the state's 43 degree-granting institutions.

Ms. Cook serves as Secretary/Treasurer of the Mississippi Association of Colleges and administers the routine functions of the association along with coordinating the annual Junior-Senior College Conference, the legislatively-sponsored Higher Education Appreciation Day (HEADWAE), and the Halbrook Awards for Academic Achievement Among Athletes.

She serves on the Board of Directors of the Mississippi Authority for Educational Television.

Ms. Cook is an honorary member of the National Honor Society of Public Affairs and Administration's prestigious Phi Alpha Alpha. Other honors include Outstanding Young Women of America, Who's Who in the South and the Southeast and Who's Who in the World of Women. She is a co-founder of the Atta Girl Network of Jackson. She is a Communicant at the Chapel of the Cross Episcopal Church of Madison.

She was the first woman appointed to the position of Associate Commissioner as well as the first woman Assistant Secretary of State for Administration (1984-1987), Executive Director of the Governor's Office of Federal-State Programs and Director of the Department of Administration's Federal-State Programs (1980-1984), and Chief of the Classification and Compensation Division of the State Personnel Board (1977-1980).

Ms. Cook graduated from Shelby High School in 1963. She received a degree in accounting from Delta State College and a master's of business administration from Mississippi College. Her life is shared with two sons. Shone Cook was born in 1969, and Stan Cook was born in 1976. She has two godchildren, Ferrell Ayers and Robert Kittrell Wilson.

Ms. Cook is a native of Shelby, Mississippi, and the daughter of the late Floyd and Gladys Homer. She has one sister, Dell Homer Kittrell of Cleveland. Ms. Cook was born January 18, 1945. She resides at 530 Hunters Creek Circle in Madison, Mississippi.